THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

Vol. 12 JULY, 1937 No. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

Spenser As a Fabulist (Part II) ..... *Louis S. Friedland* 133

Recurrent Poetic Theme ..... *Max I. Baym* 155

Notes and Comments on *Henry IV, Part I* ..... *George C. Taylor* 159

Granville-Barker's *Hamlet* ..... *Robert M. Smith* 168

Mr. Granville-Barker and *Hamlet* ..... *R. W. Babcock* 173

British and American Staging of Shakspere ..... *A. Michael Myers* 180

Some Notes on Robert Frost and Shakspere ..... *Robert S. Newdick* 187

Editorial Notes and Comments ..... *S. A. Tannenbaum* 190

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 808 West End Avenue, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 808 West End Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1935, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/shakespeare-association-bulletin_1937-07_12_3

SPENSER AS A FABULIST

By LOUIS S. FRIEDLAND

(*Continued from Volume 12, No. 2*)

II. *The Ape and her Young* (May Eclogue, 95-102).

Perhaps the commonest use of the fable—E. K. exemplifies the method—is by way of a more or less elaborate simile, often with a moral appended. It is thus that Spenser relates the matter of the Ape and her Young:

> "Sike mens follie I cannot compare
> Better then to the apes folish care,
> That is so enamoured of her young one,
> (And yet, God wote, such cause hath she none)
> That with her hard hold, and straight embracing,
> She stoppeth the breath of her youngling.
> So often times, when as good is meant,
> Evil ensueth of wrong entent."

In Avianus, Aesop,[95] and other fabulists of early times, the Ape has two children of whom she chokes the favorite with her loving-kindness. In addition to these standard sources Spenser may have read the fable in Pliny's *Natural History*[96] and in Erasmus' *Similia.*[97] Contemporary allusions to the fable are numerous. Lyly refers to it in *Euphues*[98] and in *Love's Metamorphosis;*[99] Whitney relates it as "The Ape and her Whelp" under the rubric "Caecus amor prolis";[100] Greene adheres to the early version of the fable: "The Ape ever killeth that young one which he loveth most with embracing it too fervently." [101] Topsell accepts the tale as a bit of sound natural history.[102]

It is highly probable that this fable gave rise to the proverbial phrase, "To kill with kindness." In this connection the title of Thomas Heywoods play, *A Woman Killed with Kindness,* has often been cited. In the *Taming of the Shrew* Shakspere quotes the proverb: "This is the way to kill a

---

95 Jacobs, *op. cit.,* II. 229, 246; I. 261, 263.

96 VIII. lxxxv. (W. L. Renwick, *op. cit.,* p. 195).

97 I. 612F. (Tilley, *op. cit.,* p. 67).

98 P. 198: "Glad was I to send them abroad lest . . . I should resemble the ape and kill it with culling it."

99 IV. 2. 74: "That young cruel resembles old apes who kill by culling."

100 *Op. cit.,* p. 188.

101 Seager, *Shakespeare's Natural History* (London, 1896), p. 13. Greene, *Works* (Huth Library, London, 1881-86), X. 238.

102 *Four-Footed Beasts* (1607), p. 5.

wife with kindness."[103] Spenser's moral is couched in other terms, in keeping with the context; he draws an independent conclusion in the manner of the proverbial expressions that adorn the *Faerie Queene.*

III. *The Lion and the Lamb* (May Eclogue, 159).

"Or what peace has the lion with the lambe?"

I take this to be of fabular origin though expressed in Biblical phraseology.[104] As a fable narrating the peace established between the wicked *wolves*[105] and the trusting sheep, it goes back to Phaedrus[106] whence it was transported into the Greek prose of "Aesop" and the Latin of Romulus, and the German of Steinhöwel. In Greek it is mentioned in Plutarch's *Life of Demosthenes,*[107] in Latin it exists in Abstemius and in Freitag's emblem-book. The Italian fabulists, Accio-Zuccho,[109] Cesar Pavesio[110] and Luigi Guicciardino[111] recount the story as do the French *Ysopets I* and *II,* Julius Machault,[112] Haudent, Corrozet, and others. Finally we have LaFontaine's inimitable recital, *Les Loups et les Brebis*[113] of the peace broken by the wolves who slay the sheep and the sleeping dogs. In a passage of the *Faerie Queene* Spenser himself recalls the earlier allusion:

> "The lyon there did with the lambe consort,
> And eke the dove sat by the faulcons side."[114]

IV. The Fox and the Kid (May Eclogue, 170-313).

"This tale is much like to that in Aesops fables," says E. K. in the Gloss, "but the catastrophe and end is farre different." About equal in length with "The Oak and the Briar," the story of the kid deceived by the wily fox is

---

103 IV. i. 211. Other occurrences of the proverb are noted in Tilley, *op. cit.,* p. 67. *Oxford Book of Proverbs,* under, "to kill with kindness."

104 *Isaiah,* 11.6; 65.25. *Micah,* 5.8.

105 *F. Q.,* I. vi. x—"Greedie Wolf and seely lambe."

106 Jacobs, *op. cit.,* II. 87; I. 246. Robert, *op. cit.,* I. 201-06.

107 Section 33.

108 Arnold Freitag, *op. cit.,* 11.

109 *Aesopi Fabulae* (Romae, 1843), 53.

110 *Il Targa che contiene 150 favole* (Venezia, 1575), 110.

111 *Detti e Fatti* (Venice, 1566), pp. 15, 77.

112 *Esope,* etc. (Lion, 1484), 53. These references are taken from Robert, *op. cit.* I. 201-206.

113 III. xiii.

114 IV. viii. xxxi. 1-2. Cf. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb." (*Is.* 11:6); "The wolf and lamb shall feed together. (*Is.* 65:25).

related with animation and the half-humorous verisimilitude which is the "pathetic fallacy" of the beast-fable.

"The Fox and the Kid" illustrates at its best Spenser's method of handling traditional Aesopic material.[115] In fable-literature the tale is told about a *wolf* and a kid. In Caxton's *Aesop*,[116] for example, the Goat warns her offspring not to open the door under any circumstances; the Kid obeys the sage counsel, refuses to admit the Wolf, and is saved. Moral: the perils of disobedience. The many analogues cited by Robert, Hervieux, Jacobs, depart from this version in but few particulars.

How completely Spenser transforms the age-old fable! Very little more than the incentive moment, the Goat's need to go to the woods for food, is retained, as is the idea of the Wolf's disguise and change of voice; everything else is original, freshly conceived. The Fox replaces the Wolf, who never did have sufficient wit and resourcefulness to attain his aim; the basic situation is altered; the incidents are new; "the catastrophe and end," as E. K. notes, "are farre different." At the same time the poet is careful to preserve the essential features of the fable as an art-form: the strictly limited number of actors and the moral rounding out the whole matter. But he expands the narrow framework of the Fable; his recital is leisurely and detailed instead of being pithy and brief; he takes pains to describe and characterize the three animals, dwelling not alone on their outer aspect and apparel but on their emotional reactions. The callow innocence of the adolescent Kid, the motherly anxiety of the Goat, her sorrowful memories of her deceased mate, the superstitious dread of her stumbling over the threshold, the realistic touches in the portrayal of

---

115 R. B. McKerrow, in his definitive edition of Nashe (IV., note to page 316 of vol. III), says that this fable is not to be found in the Aesopic literature of the period. This is an error due, presumably, to the fact that there is no Fox in the contemporary fables, its place being taken by the Wolf. On the other hand, E. Koeppel (*Eng. Studien,* XVIII. 1893, p. 130), claims that "Die fabel von dem thoerichten zicklein, welches sich von dem fuchs bewegen laesst . . . war allen elisabethanischen litteraten wohl bekannt." There is no evidence to substantiate this. The writers and educated folk of the time undoubtedly knew the Aesopic fables about the *Wolf,* the Goat, and the Kid, but the introduction of the Fox is due to Spenser, as we shall see. Higginson, *op. cit.,* p. 85: "Such a fable as Spenser's may be found not only in Aesop . . . but in almost any collection, such as *The Seven Sages* and the *Fables of Bidpai.*" Again, the Fox does not appear in these fables. See also, *2 Sam.* xii. 1-9.

116 Caxton (ed. Jacobs), Bk. II. fable 9, p. 44. See the list of analogues in *Ibid,* I. 240, and in Robert, *op. cit.,* I. 277-281.

the Fox—all these are in the manner of the Reynard stories, of the beast-tale rather than the fable. In the fable each animal possesses two or three standard traits bestowed upon it by traditional folk-lore; the traits are taken for granted and the fabulist need say very little about them. Spenser, however, like the authors of the Reynard cycle and the writers of epyllia, enlarges the fable to a narrative art-form of wider scope and content.

In essentials, though with the broader sweep befitting the animal-tale, Spenser employs the same method in *Mother Hubberds Tale*.[117] The following passage from the May Eclogue assuredly recalls the Fox of the later poem:

> "It was not long after shee was gone,
> But the false Foxe came to the dore anone;
> Not as a foxe, for then he had be kend,
> But all as a poore pedler he did wend,
> Bearing a trusse of tryfles at hys backe,
> As bells, and babes, and glasses, in hys packe.
> A biggen he had got about his brayne,
> For in his headpeace he felt a sore payne:
> His hinder heele was wrapt in a clout,
> For with great cold he had gotte the gout.
> There at the dore he cast me downe hys pack,
> And layd him downe, and groned, 'Alack! alack!
> Ah, deare Lord! and sweete Saint Charitee!
> That some good body would once pitie mee!' "
> (ll. 235-248).

Details of this sort, together with the free use of homely dialogue and the almost psychological humanizing of the animals in "The Fox and the Kid" (and of the plants in "The Oak and the Briar"), are Spenser's justification for his claim of Chaucerian inspiration for these two fables. However correct E. K. is in calling them Aesopic, Spenser is equally right in attributing them to the influence of his master, Chaucer.[118] Based on Aesopian material, they are Chaucerian in method and manner; that they are enlargements of the Fable is due, in large measure, to Spenser's reading of his Tityrus' authentic as well as spurious tales about animals.

---

117 For other parallels between the two works see, H. S. V. Jones, *A Spenser Handbook* (N. Y., 1930), p. 100.

118 Referring to a fable about the Fox, the Wolf, and the Lion, not found in Aesop, Lyly says: "I cannot tell whether it be a Canterbury tale or a fable in Aesop." (*Euphues*, ed. Croll and Clemons, p. 240).

At the very outset Spenser makes it plain that a special meaning is implicit in "The Fox and the Kid." But the allegory is never allowed to obtrude in the narrative or to retard or deflect its direct course. Because of the natural and convincing incidents, the life-like actors, the vivid and credible details, the story exists for itself. Removed from the pastoral context, "The Fox and the Kid", like "The Oak and the Briar", becomes a fable pure and simple. Even the final lesson is the customary moral conclusion associated with the art-form.

E. K. leaves us in no doubt as to the hidden meaning of the fable. "In this fift Aeglogue," he writes in the *Argument,* "under the persons of two shepheards . . . be represented two formes of pastoures or ministers, or the Protestant and the Catholic. . . . With whom [the latter] having shewed that it is daungerous to mainteine any felowship, or give too much credit to their colourable and feyned goodwill, he telleth him a tale of the Foxe, that by such a counterpoynt of craftines deceived and devoured the credulous Kidde." To the same effect E. K. explains in the Gloss: "By the Kidde may be understoode the simple sort of the faythfull and true Christians. By hys dame, Christe, that hath alreadie with carefull watchewords (as heere doth the gote) warned his little ones, to beware of such doubling deceit. By the Foxe, the false and faithlesse Papistes, to whom is no credit to be given, nor felowshippe to be used."[119] This statement of the fable's purpose, accepted by critics and editors, can scarcely be improved upon; it is in perfect agreement with the purport of the May Eclogue. J. J. Higginson, however, intent on his task of discovering contemporary allusions, wishes to narrow the more general application to a specific circumstance.[120] Starting with the premise that the Fox represents the Anglo-Catholics who sought to revive the ancient religious forms: founts, crucifixes, vestments, etc., he concludes that the beast stands particularly for Lord Burghley, to whose care as legal guardian the first Earl of Essex confided his young son. It is Mr. Higginson's contention that Burghley endeavored to wean

119 The religious background of the May Eclogue and the fable is admirably treated by Miss Parmenter, *op. cit.,* pp. 203ff.

120 *Op. cit.,* pp. 84 ff.

young Essex away from the staunch Puritanism of his father's family.[121]

Higginson bases his case on the following circumstances: 1. young Essex was nine years old at the time of his father's death; 2. the reference to the Kid in Spenser's poem (l. 191) as "poore orphane," which Higginson regards as an allusion to the newly orphaned ward of Burghley; 3. in the poem the Fox claims kinship with the Kid: "Sicker, I am very sybbe to you." (l. 269). It seems that Lord Burghley, not of noble birth or family, created for himself a genealogy in which he claimed blood ties with some of the chief families of England, among them the Devereux.

Let us examine the facts. In the first place, Burghley was not the sole guardian of young Essex. The dying Earl had specifically appointed Burghley *and the Lord Chamberlain* (the Earl of Sussex).[122] Secondly, the young orphan remained in Burghley's household from January 11, 1577, to May of the same year, when he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, at a very tender age.[123] In a period of four months Burghley could hardly have succeeded in undermining the child's faith. In a letter addressed to William Cecil, Lady Essex and her son give thanks to the guardian for his generous hospitality.[124] The Essex estate was almost insolvent, and Burghley was put to some expense, then and later, in behalf of his young ward. With the boy's formative years he had little if anything to do. A few years of university life, followed by several more years of travel on the continent, removed Robert Devereux from Burghley's influence and placed him under the guidance of his tutor and traveling companions. In all this time Burghley saw nothing of the lad, and could have urged opinions upon him only by letter. No such documents exist to bear out Mr. Higginson's case.

These facts reduce the significance of "poore orphane" and "very sybbe to you" to wiredrawn analogies. In the fables the fox always claims kinship with his victims. What

121 Only one scholar of note has accepted Higginson's argument, *i. e.*, H. E. Cory, *E. Spenser, A Critical Study* (Berkeley, Calif., 1917), pp. 23 ff.

122 Walter B. Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex* (London, 1852), I. 144, reprints the dying Earl's letter to Cecil. Higginson refers to this book, but for some obscure reason omits mention of Burghley's co-guardian. The *DNB* (under, *Robert Devereux*) points out that the Lord Chamberlain was entrusted especially with the military training of the boy.

123 *Ibid.*, pp. 163 ff.

124 *Ibid.*, p. 166.

is more, there is no reason for accusing the Lord Chancellor of being expressly anti-puritan in his sentiments or his acts. Sincere in his religious practice, Burghley was not a bigot; as a man of affairs he proved willing to compromise whenever necessary. He cooperated with the Puritan leader, the Earl of Leicester, and enjoyed the friendship and confidence of Sir Francis Walsingham, an ardent Puritan.

As regards the identification of Burghley with the Fox of Spenser's fable, Mr. Higginson may properly point to similar discoveries: Burghley as the Fox in *Mother Hubberds Tale* and in the *Ruines of Time*. I believe that too much has been made of Spenser's animosity towards Burghley. Only an ultra-Freudian psychologist would maintain that every time Spenser mentioned the word "fox" he thought of Burghley because the first Cecil is supposed to have given him cause for discontent. Fabulists have remarked on the habit of raising molehills to the stature of mountains.

At this point we need to ask the question: Why did Spenser change Aesop's fable by substituting a Fox for the Wolf? The answer is twofold. First, neither the wolf of the fables nor Ysengrim of the Reynard cycle possessed the necessary duplicity and cunning to play the rôle in Spenser's tale. In fabular and Reynard literature the Wolf is forever a foiled villain;[125] his plottings are excellent in intention, from his standpoint, but he hasn't the address to carry them out. In most cases he is lucky to escape with a sound drubbing. Except in the fable of "The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing" he is more often the deceived rather than the deceiver, and even there he seldom succeeds in his attempts, as we shall see in Spenser's version of the story (September Eclogue). Desiring "a catastrophe and end far different" from the usual versions, Spenser dismisses the Wolf and turns naturally to the Fox, whom fable and beast-tale represent as eminently successful in his ruses.

The second reason for Spenser's choice has a direct bearing on the problem of the allegory in "The Kid and the

125 See the analogues in Hervieux, Robert, and Jacobs. As a characteristic example one might read Fable No. 89 of Marie de France: *De lupo et capra* (Karl Warnke, *Die Fabeln der Marie de France,* Halle, 1898), pp. 290-291. Following his prototype closely, LaFontaine recites first *Le Loup, la Chèvre, et le Chevreau* (IV. xv.), where the Wolf's discomfiture reminds him of an even more drastic foiling of this beast's purposes, and he relates this in the succeeding fable: *Le Loup, la Mère, et l'Enfant.*

Fox." As E. K. very well knew, the religio-political literature of the time constantly represented the Jesuits and Catholic recusants under the guise of the Fox. The Martin Marprelate group, William Turner in particular, adopted the stock symbol which custom had firmly established not alone in England but in several countries of the continent: Holland, Germany, France. *The Huntynge of the Fox,*[126] *Yet a Course at the Fox,* and similar titles are characteristic of polemic works aimed at the Catholics. Occasionally, as happened in France, a Catholic writer would turn the tables and picture his enemies, the Puritan-Huguenots, under the vulpine symbol. Assuredly it is proper to regard the *Shepheardes Calender* as to some extent a document in the religio-polemic literature of sixteenth-century England, and this fact gives warrant to E. K.'s comments anent the fable of "The Fox and the Kid."

One further suggestion of a contemporary allusion in this fable merits our attention. It is offered by Miss Mary Parmenter in her excellent paper on Spenser's *Twelve Eclogues.*[127] In Spenser's "Kiddie" she sees "the boy king of Scotland who, in 1579 . . . had fallen an easy victim to a Papist 'Fox'—his French cousin, Esmé Stuart, Duc D'Aubigny, who completely captivated him before the eyes of the indignant 'English' or Protestant party in Edinburgh . . . The Queen herself, or her policy of careful 'Motherliness' so constantly maintained throughout the 1570's, is the woeful 'Gate.'" And Miss Parmenter adds:

126 William Turner, *The huntyng and fyndyng out of the Romyshe foxe* (1543, 2 ed.). This is reproduced as No. 88 of the MLA Photographic Facsimiles. I note this passage in Turner's preface: "The prophane wryters have a proverbe: 'he hath not torne Esope.'" Higginson, *op. cit.,* pp. 127-28. F. M. Padelford: "Spenser likens the Papists to wolves and the High Church party to foxes." (*Mod. Philol.,* XI. 1913-14, p. 104). But what of E. K.'s express statement: "By the Foxe [may be understood] the false and faithlesse Papistes"? The same objection arises in connection with Harold Stein's highly interesting paper on "Spenser and William Turner" *MLN.* LVI (1936), pp. 345ff. Mr. Stein writes: "Thus to Turner a fox is a person who seems to be or pretends to be a member of the Church of England, though at heart he has Romish beliefs, while a wolf is a Romanist in both belief and outward profession. Edwardian foxes become Marian wolves, and . . . Marian wolves similarly become Elizabethan foxes. . . . It seems certain that Turner's use of 'fox' and 'wolf' is unimpeachable as a criterion for interpreting Spenser (and E. K.)." I wonder if this is not to make cut and dried a matter in which the poet would have allowed himself sufficient latitude. We must remember that Bishop John Young, whose "selfe boye" Spenser was during the making of much of the Calendar, can hardly be described as "Low Church" in his sentiments. Perhaps William Turner explains the matter when he writes, as quoted by Stein (p. 349): "A Foxe and a Wolfe, are very like in diners thinges, thinke ye it not possible, but yt an olde Foxe mai go forth of kinde into a Wolfe?"

127 *ELH.* III. (1936), pp. 190-217.

"Anyone familiar with the records can see how pertinent and how irresistibly amusing the whole application is."[128]

Right enough, but to what extent was Spenser familiar with these hidden moves and motives in the game of contemporary politics? In the matter of the Duc d'Alençon the Queen fooled the very members of her Privy Council, let alone outsiders like Spenser. Her reasons for carrying on the preposterous marriage negotiations with "Monsieur" were, as Miss Parmenter admits, not at all clearly understood at the time.[129] We must be careful not to believe that our retrospective knowledge of historical forces and motives was shared by all contemporaries of the events. I should think it almost impossible for Spenser to have known what was happening in the Court of Scotland in the autumn of 1579 and to have written about it (most of the *Shepherdes Calender* was composed in 1578, or earlier) with a complete understanding of the situation in the very same year. A diplomat, on the spot and gifted with unusual insight, might be able to gauge aright the doings of the Court, but Spenser, far from the scene of action in Scotland and not particularly intimate with the court-circle in his own land, might be left to his ignorance.

The fable under discussion does not seem to have enjoyed the popularity accorded to its companion-piece of the February Eclogue. So far as I know, only one author of importance refers to it, namely, Nashe in his Preface to Greene's *Menaphon:* "which makes his famisht followers to imitate the Kidde in Aesop, who enamored with the Foxes newfangles, forsooke all hopes of life, to leape into a new occupation."[130] The allusion to the Fox (not the Wolf), and the use of the word "newfangles," appear to indicate that Nashe had Spenser's fable in mind. This is the well-known passage in which a number of scholars, following the lead of Fleay and Sarazin, have discovered an allusion by Nashe to Thomas Kyd, thus precipitating a voluminous and apparently endless controvery.[131] In view of the modern fashion in anagogical interpretation, it is a

128 *Idem,* p. 205.
129 *Ibid.*
130 Nash (ed. McKerrow), III. 316.
131 Covering three closely packed pages of McKerrow's volume of Notes (vol. IV), pp. 449-452. As I read Mr. McKerrow's admirable review of the complicated discussion in which a baker's dozen of authors take part, I have the conviction that he is not taken in by the unscholarly game of shadow-boxing.

cause for surprise that no one has suggested the identical discovery based on Spenser's "Kidde," especially when it is remembered that Kyd was a Merchant Taylors' boy, for four years contemporary at the school with the poet.[132] A perfect analogy which, fortunately, may be consigned to limbo.

Another literary allusion to the fable of "The Fox and the Kid" was discovered by Koeppel.[133] It occurs in an eclogue by Edward Fairfax, the Spenserian translator of Tasso's epic poem. Fairfax wrote a dozen eclogues of which only two are extant.[134] His tale of the Fox and the Kid, while related to Spenser's in theme and religious connotation, was influenced also by the Reynard cycle. I quote the only passage which has some resemblance to Spenser's fable:

> "The Fox, whose Fort, *Malperdus,* border'd nie,
> Spi'd from his Keep the wandring Innocent.
> . . . . . .
> He buskt him Boon, and, on his sanded Coat,
> He buckled close a slain kid's hairy skin,
> And wore the Vizzard of a smooth-fac't Goat;
> All Saint without, none spi'd the Devill within!"[135]

V. *The Eagle and the Shellfish* (July Eclogue, 217-228).

> "One daye he sat upon a hyll,
> As now thou wouldest me:
> But I am taught, by Algrins ill,
> To love the lowe degree.
> For sitting so with bared scalpe,
> An Eagle sored hye,
> That, weening hys whyte head was chalke,
> A shell fishe downe let flye:
> She weened the shell fishe to have broake,
> But therewith bruzd his brayne;
> So now, astonied with the stroke,
> He lyes in lingring payne."

The Shepherd Algrind is Archbishop Grindal for whom the poet expresses deep admiration throughout the Eclogue. It would almost seem that Spenser was a devout listener to

---

132 *The Works of Thomas Kyd* (ed. Boas, Ox., 1901), p. xvi.

133 *Anglia,* XII (1889), p. 109.

134 Koeppel says one. He had evidently not seen Fairfax's other Eclogue, "Hermes and Lycaon," printed in the Miscel. of the Philobiblion Soc. (London, 1868-69), XII.

135 "Eglon and Alexis" (Mrs. E. Cooper, *The Muses' Library,* Lond., 1737, p. 367). We must remember that the text represents this good lady's transcription. The probable date of the Eclogue is 1603.

one of the good prelate's sermons delivered in 1564 in which occurs this passage: "Aeschylus the poet lying on sleep bareheaded near the sea, a great seafowl, thinking his head to be a stone whereon he might break the shell-fish which he carried, let it fall on his head, wherewith he was killed out of hand."[136] The coincidence is all the more striking since the classical versions speak not of a *shell-fish* but definitely of a "tortoise."

The allegoric meaning of this little myth upon the fate of Grindal has often been explained. Herford's interpretation is representative.[137] He identifies the she-eagle with Queen Elizabeth who, desiring to "crush" the Puritans (the shell-fish), sought to make Grindal, the newly appointed Archbishop of Canterbury (1575), the instrument of the blow. "But Grindal, not being 'chalk,' declined to be used thus; whereupon the blow intended for the Puritans spent itself upon him." The "blow" refers to a measure directed against unauthorized preaching, especially by laymen, and inspired expounding of the Scriptures, known as "prophesying." Now, Grindal saw no harm but rather good in the "prophesying;" instead of agreeing to carry out the Queen's edict he wrote her a dignified letter[138] explaining his position. The determined sovereign sequestrated him (June, 1577) from his official functions for a period of six months. The sequestration was still in force when Spenser wrote his *Calender,* and the poet must have known, also, of the sad state of Grindal's health, with blindness to augment the torment.

Actually, the "blow" did not "spend itself" upon Grindal; other dignitaries did not share his scruples concerning the measures to stamp out prophesying. Men like Aylmer and Whitgift were but too eager to carry out the royal wishes, and the free preaching was largely checked. There is little to add to Herford's account. With the fall of Grindal, Spenser's Bishop, John Young of Rochester, whom Edmund Grindal had befriended, stood no longer in the

---

136 *The Remains of Archbishop Grindal* (Parker Soc.), p. 8. Quoted by Long, *op. cit.,* p. 735.

137 *Op. cit.,* pp. 151-52.

138 Given in Strype, *History of the Life and Acts of Edmund Grindal* (L., 1710). According to Mary Parmenter, *op. cit.,* p. 206, the reasons for Grindal's sequestration was his opposition to Elizabeth's foreign policy, though her note to this passage cites Strype to the effect that the cause was Grindal's setting forth of the true relations of the temporal and spiritual powers in the letter mentioned.

Queen's favor.[139] Because of this situation Dr. Percy W. Long sees in Spenser's "shellfish" a covert allusion to Young, whom Dr. Long brings into the matter in a rather curious way. On the authority of E. E. Dorling's *Heraldry of the Church,* this scholar states: "There it appears that a golden scallop dominates the arms of the Bishop of Rochester."[140] I have not seen Dorling's work, but in Strype's *Annals of the Reformation* I come upon the following passage in an account of John Young's promotion to the Bishopric: "The arms granted him upon his becoming bishop by garter king of arms were, *gyronne of four, gules and azure, a lion fesse, passant, guardant between two flower de luce, or.*"[141] Not a sign of a scallop! Even if there were, however, I should doubt whether it is well to read into Spenser's brief fable more than the slim substance will hold.

The myth of "The Eagle and the Shellfish" is deeply rooted in the folk-lore of many peoples, Asiatic, African, European, and North American.[142] A comparative study of its history, evolution, and dissemination would in itself exceed the limits of a philological paper. In the Preface to his edition of North's rendering of Doni's *Morall Philosophie* (1570),[143] Joseph Jacobs gives some idea of the myth's antiquity and ramifications, from the Hindu originals to the English of Thomas North. It may be held as likely that Spenser, a lover of picture-books and illustrations, read Doni's redaction of Bidpai's fables and studied the woodcuts in the volume. He may have noted the illustration, at p. 118, of the old gentleman upon whose bald head a shellfish (a crab or a frog) has just been dropped by the eagle hovering above. As Mr. Jacobs says, "The illustrations of the Fables were regarded as an integral part of the text, and were 'translated,' so to speak, along with it."[144]

---

139 Percy W. Long, *op. cit.,* p. 718: "With Grindal's eclipse, Young's promotion stopped for the rest of his life."

140 *Ibid,* p. 734

141 Oxford, 1824, II. ii. 184.

142 See the discussion by J. Jacobs in his edition of North's Doni's *Morall Philosophie* (1570), Lond., 1888. Also, the same author's ed. of Caxton's *Fables,* I. 60 ff., and 236, 259;II.20,217. P. Soulié, *op. cit.,* pp. 39 ff.

143 *Ibid. Doni, La Moral Filosophia* (Venice, 1552). Keith Falconer, *The Bidpai Fables,* (Cambr., 1885). See the list of analogues cited by Kenneth McKenzie, "Italian Fables in Verse" *PMLA,* XXI (1906), 266 ff. In Ben Jonson, *The Silent Woman,* IV, iv. 74 ff., La Foole says: "There's an excellent booke of morall philosophie . . . of Raynard the Foxe, and all the beasts, called 'Dones Philosophie'." Jonson has confused the work with *Reynard the Fox.*

144 *Op. cit.,* I. p. ix.

But the woodcut in Doni's volume is only one of many on this theme, some of them with the old man in the picture and some without him, as in the woodcut at p. 113 of Verdizotti's *Cento favole morali.*

It is not impossible to conceive that the applications of this legend to Aeschylus originated as a joke on a bald-headed man.[145] And the myth was too widespread for us to believe that Spenser discovered it first in North's *Morall Philosophie.* In all probability it was a common bit of school-learning acquired, as one progressed in Latinity, from Pliny,[146] or Valerius Maximus,[147] or Aelian.[148] Perhaps this accounts for the fact that a notable Latinist, Montaigne, describes the legend: "Eschylus, menaçé de la chute d'une maison, a beau se tenir à l'airte; le voyer assomé d'un toict de tortue, que eschappa des pattes d'un aigle."[149]

Once more Spenser disguises a truth unpalatable alike to Court and Church, in the form of an outwardly innocent fable. For, like all true fabulists, Spenser knew that

> "La fable est le miel enchanté
> Qui nous fait prendre gout à l'âpre vérité.[150]

VI. *The Dog and the Flesh* (September Eclogue, 58-61).

> "Wel-away the while I was so fonde
> To leave the good, that I had in hande,
> In hope of better that was uncouth!
> So lost the Dogge the flesh in his mouth."

"This fable seems to be very seldom used in the Pastoral," is Professor Mustard's comment on these lines, and he quotes a passage in illustration from the Seventh Eclogue by Faustus Andrelinus (ll. 41-43).[151] In fabular and general literature, however, no apologue is of more frequent occurrence, both as a separate recital and in allusive use,

---

145 Which he himself may have inspired, since a fragment of one of his lost plays, *Myrmidon,* has to do with an eagle hoist with its own petard. (ap. Schol. on Aristophanes, *Aves,* 808).

146 *Nat. Hist.* X., 3. 7, as cited by W. P. Mustard, "Notes on the *Shepheardes Calendar*" *MLN.* XXX (1920), 371-72.

147 IX. 12 (Mustard, *idem*).

148 *De Nat. Animal* VII. 16. (Mustard, *idem*).

149 *Essais,* I. 19. (Trans. by Trechmann, I. 79). A favorite book of Browning's, Nathaniel Wanley's *Wonders of the Little World* (Lond., 1774), p. 505, col. 2, tells the fable and gives these authorities: Horace, *Arte Poet.,* 279; Voss. *de Poetis Graec.,* page 25 of chap. 4; and Quintillian, *Orat.,* I. 10, col. 1, page 468.

150 Frédéric Bataille.

151 *Op. cit.,* p. 371.

often as a simile in the identical manner adopted by Spenser in the lines we are considering. Of Indian origin,[152] the tale of "the Dog and his Shadow" is included in all but a very few collections, beginning with the *Panchatranta* (IV. 8) and proceeding through Bidpai, Romulus (I. v. 10), Aesop,[153] Babrius (79), Phaedrus (I. 4), Alciati (Emblem 66), and Faerno (31).[154] Almost all the Italian redactors treat this apologue, and French fabulists take especial delight in it, from Marie de France (5), and *Ysopet I* and *II* down to the moderns[155] In England, Lydgate paid his respects to the age-old legend, making use of a familiar variant:

> "How a grete hownd over a brigge square,
> A large chese in his mouth he bare."[156]

As may be expected, the oft-repeated fable gave birth to a proverb: "to catch at the shadow and lose the substance." The compilers of proverb-dictionaries speak of this as "of late origin," but the expression was in use as early as 1599: "Do but as Aesops dogge, that a substance lost for a shadow."[157] Spenser's form of the fable similarly illustrates an apothegm: "to leave the good in hope of better."[158] Once more we see how closely linked are the Fable and the Proverb. Inevitably a popular fable finds its essential meaning epitomized in a sententious title which frequently comes to do duty as a maxim;[159] at the same time, fables of this kind give rise to adages which sum up their homely moral teaching.

VII. *The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing* (September Eclogue, ll. 141-49; 156-161; 170-71; 180-225).

---

152 *The Fables of Aesop* (London & N. Y., 1894), pp. 199-200.

153 Jacobs, ed. of Caxton's *Aesop,* II. 10; I. 231-32.

154 See the lists of analogues in Jacobs, *idem,* and in Robert, *op. cit.,* II. 49.

155 The lists of analogues as above. Verdizotti's *Cento favole morali* has a very fine woodcut, p. 37, on the theme. To the French lists of analogues add: Watriquet de Corwin, *Li Despis dou monde,* ed. Scherer, v. 33; Robert Gaguin, *Passetemps d'oysiveté* (Recueil de Poésie franc. des xv^e^ et xvi^e^ siècles, vii. 276).

156 *Anglia,* IX (1886), fable 8. For a list of other early uses of the fable see H. E. Rollins, ed. of *Paradise of Dainty Devices* (Cambridge, U. S., 1927), p. 70, l. 16 (by Richard Hill), and parallels at pp. 234-235.

157 *The First Booke of the Preservation of King Henry the VII.,* 1599 (cited by H. E. Rollins, *op. cit.*)

158 Compare, Thomas Edwards, *Cephalus and Procris,* 1595 ed. Roxburge Club, p. 51): "For see how Esops dog was quite forgone, And lost the substance weening further gain."—Cited by H. E. Rollins, *idem.*

159 *E. g.,* "the dog in the manger," "the wolf in sheep's clothing," "the ass in lion's skin."

In the midst of an Eclogue devoted to certain aspects of the contemporary religious problem, Spenser introduces the tale of the Wolf disguished in Sheep's Clothing. The theme is sounded several times before the actual "parable" is related. We hear it first in ll. 141-149:

> "Sike as the shepheards, sike bene her sheepe.
> . . . . . .
> For many han into mischiefe fall,
> And bene of ravenous wolves yrent,
> All for they nould be buxome and bent."

Again, in ll. 156-161, Diggon says:

> "Yes, but they gang in more secrete wise,
> And with sheepes clothing doen hem disguise:
> They walke not widely as they were wont,
> For feare of raungers and the great hunt,
> But prively prolling to and froe,
> Enaunter they mought be inly knowe."

The actual tale of what "chaunced to Roffyn not long ygo" does not begin until line 172.

It will be seen that this "fable" is different in kind from either "the Oak and the Briar" or "the Fox and the Kid." Like "the Eagle and the Shellfish" it is imbedded in the Eclogue of which it is an inseparable part, whereas the two earlier apologues exist largely for themselves and their intrinsic, though illustrative, interest. In fact, the theme, however appropriate to the month of September,[160] may be considered an elaboration of a passage in the May Eclogue, the first of Spenser's three ecclesiastical satires:

> "Tho, under colour of Shepeheards, somewhile
> There crept in wolves, ful of fraude and guile,
> That often devoured their owne sheepe,
> And often the shepheards that did hem keepe."
> (ll. 126-129)

As we have seen, the poet transforms the Wolf of the May fable into a Fox disguised as a pedlar, but in the September Eclogue the Wolf remains to be finally defeated in his design, since this Eclogue is throughout definitely of religious purport. The very tale of the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing is Biblical in inspiration, and Spenser must have

160 Mary Parmenter, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-210. Harold Stein, *op. cit.*

remembered the sentence in Matthew (vii. 15): "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves;" or the other exhortation of the same Evangelist, echoed by John: "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves," (Matthew, x.16); or Jeremiah (5:6): "a wolf of the evening shall spoil them." More elaborate treatment of the subject of the Shepherd and the lost lamb occurs in the parable spoken by the Prophet Samuel (2Sam. xii.1-9), the prototype of John's Parable of the Good Shepherd (chap 10), and of Luke's Parable of the lost sheep brought back to the fold by the faithful shepherd (15:1-7). Religious literature and pulpit oratory rang every possible change on the familiar theme, while secular writings, especially the pastoral in its various forms, were replete with references to wolves disguised in sheep's garb for the purpose of ravin and betrayal.

With all this, Spenser's parable shows the well-known Aesopic coloring. As we have already noted, fable-literature delighted in tales of the Wolf, whom it made a stock figure for the portrayal of overweening ambition forever ending in bafflement and frustration. This figure was seized upon by the compilers of the Reynard cycle, in which the Wolf becomes the symbol of forlorn causes and the victim of every comic contretemps.

That Spenser's Wolf is foiled is in keeping with the fabular tradition of the tale. In the fables the wolf often passes as a shepherd, but the versions of the story differ in some particulars. An early recital of the apologue is found in *Extravagantes* v. 15, and another in Abstemius.[161] The Italian Verdizotti includes it in his collection as fable no. 42, with woodcut, as usual. The Frenchman Jehan Molinet tells about *Le Loup devenu Berger,*[162] and La Fontaine follows him in the third fable of Book Three.[163]

Spenser's handling of the Biblico-fabular material agrees with that which had become traditional in pastoral poetry. His master in the genre, Mantuan, makes the tale an integral

161 Jacobs, *op. cit.,* II. 180; I. 225.

162 P. Soullié, *op. cit.,* pp. 186 ff.

163 Cf. the fables of "Wolves and Sheep," and "Dog, Wolf, and Wether." Also, the fable of the "Wolf and the Dog," as related by Phaedrus (III. 7); by Avianus (Nevelet, p. 420,482); Corrozet, 52; Haudent, I. 205; Meslier, 28.

part of his Ninth Eclogue;[164] Lydgate treats it in similar manner in his Third Fable ("Wolf and Sheep")[165] and refers to it in the Fourth ("Dog and Sheep");[166] Barclay's First Eclogue has the lines:

> "Sometime the wolfe our beastes doth devour,
> And sometime the thefe awayteth for his hour."[167]

And just as Spenser introduces a topical allusion to John Young, Bishop of Rochester (*Roffensis*), under the guise of Roffyn, so Barclay puns on the name of Bishop Alcocke in the following lines of his First Eclogue:

> "And all was coke, he wakened up from sleepe,
> And while we slumbred he did our foldes kepe."

The classical exemplar of these topical allusions is that of Mantuan to Falco Sinibaldus, in his Ninth Eclogue.[168]

The identification of Roffyn with Bishop John Young is well based and is today generally accepted. In 1912 J. J. Higginson developed an elaborate but unconvincing argument tending to prove that the Wolf stood for Roger, Lord North, who persecuted the aged Bishop of Ely, Dr. Richard Cox, in whose name Higginson finds the letters for a perfect anagram to form the word "Roffyn." According to the same interpreter, "Lowder" is Cox's brother-in-law, Thomas Auder or Awder, son of George Auder (or Awder), once Alderman of Cambridge.[170] Higginson evidently did not know of Spenser's employment as secretary to Dr. John Young (in 1578), as evidenced by an inscription in a copy of Turler's *Travailer* given by Spenser to Harvey,[171] nor does he note the significance of line 176 of the September Eclogue: "Colin Clout, I wene, be his selfe boye," that is, John Young's, or Roffyn's. Higginson's speculations may

---

164 Notes in Herford, *ed. cit.*, and W. L. Renwick, *ed. cit.* "[Spenser's] fable of the wolf masking as sheep, dog and master, is a sort of inversion of Mantuan's description of the masters and dogs playing the part of wolves." (Herford, p. 161).

165 P. Sauerwein, in *Anglia* IX (1886), pp. 1 ff.

166 *Idem*, l. 30, "the sely sheep." See "The Woolf and Puttock," l. 81.

167 Cf. Mantuan, III. 22-24.

168 Gabriel Harvey indulges in a similar play on an apt name: "Only my determination is, rather to be a Sheepe in Wolfes printe [John Wolfe, the printer of his *Foure Letters*, etc., 1592] then to suffer myselfe, or my dearest frendes, to be made Sheepe in the Wolfes walke." (*Works*, ed. Grosart, I. 236).

169 *Op. cit.*, pp. 128-150.

170 *Idem*, pp. 136 ff.

171 "Ex dono Edmundi Spenseri, Episcopi Roffensis Secretarii, 1578" (I. Gollancz, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1907-08, pp. 99-105).

therefore be dismissed. In an article on "Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda,"[172] Dr. F. M. Padelford accepts the Bishop of Rochester as the Roffyn of the Eclogue, at the same time suggesting that the Wolf may be Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, who, while sequestrated to Young's charge, may have attempted to turn the latter's Chancellor, Lloyd (Lowder), over to the Roman fold. A variant of this view is put forward by Emile Legouis[173] who believes that Roffyn (Young) had Spenser himself as his watchdog, Lowder. The Wolf is again Watson, to whom Spenser is thought to have almost succumbed. As we have already noted, Brents Stirling identifies Watson with the Oak of the February Eclogue. Obviously, the opinion expressed by Dr. Padelford comes closest to credibility.

In all these attempts to explain the contemporary allusion embodied in the fable of the "Wolf in Sheep's Clothing" the critics have taken for granted that Diggon Davy, who relates the fable, was a pilgrim returned from the continent where he had spent some time in the Protestant centers and had been disenchanted by the clerical laxity and corruption. In disagreement with this, Miss Parmenter advances a novel and interesting suggestion. She writes: "Diggon's tale of how Roffy, the one good shepherd, killed the cruel wolf shows by contrast an example of justice, mercy, and wisdom *in that land of violence and cruelty,* the root of whose evil was the love of money. It is not unlikely, I think, that this land was Ireland, whence Sir Henry Sidney had lately returned in bitterness, and where, there is no doubt, Diggon's account is applicable."[174]

The suitability of Ireland for Diggon Davey's reminiscenses may well be granted. Sir Henry Sidney returned in September, 1578, from his second residence in that country. He was far from pleased with the state of affairs there, and he must have lamented the very evils against which Diggon Davy inveighs. If we are to believe William Hamilton's description[175] of conditions in Ireland at that time, we must admit that Sidney had sound reason for his dis-

172 *Modern Philology,* XI (1913), pp. 85 ff. Grosart long ago (*Spenser,* I. 63), suggested the identifications of Roffyn and Young, Lowder and Lloyd, without knowledge, of course, of the poet's inscription in Turler's book.

173 *Edmund Spenser* (Paris, 1923), pp. 41-42.

174 *Op. cit.,* p. 210. The italics are mine.

175 Lord Ernest William Hamilton, *Elizabethan Ulster,* N. Y., 1919.

pleasure. Miss Parmenter's error consists in making Ireland the scene of Roffyn's exploit. Whether his wanderings had been in Ireland or on the European continent (Holland, Germany, Switzerland), Diggon Davy finally returns in person and in thought to his native England. His narrative deals with foreign parts, but the application, the fable, concerns England, since a transition of this sort is the most natural thing in the world. In *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* the recital hovers likewise from England to Ireland. To place Roffyn in Ireland is to forgo the sure identity of his person, as well as to discount the force of the line, "Colin Clout, I wene, be his self boy." I see no point in supposing that the poet imaginatively transported Roffyn to the neighboring isle.

In connection with Spenser's fable of the "Wolf in Sheep's Clothing" it would be interesting to collect the contemporary references to it. I am able to offer but a few such allusions to the fable. It may be that Spenser gave a thought to Chaucer's lines:

> "Under a shepherde sotte and necligent
> The wolf hath many a sheep and lamb to-rent."[176]

In the poet's own time the epigram by Thomas Kendall, "Of a Sheepe,"[177] could hardly have influenced him. More to the point as illustrations of the literary use of the fable are the following: 1. from the *Mirrour for Magistrates:* "The ravening Wolfe would take of Lambes the keepe;"[173] 2. George Pettie: "But like a simple man he committed the silly sheep to the ravening wolf," and, "Such ravening wolves in sheep's clothing are readiest to devour such sweet sheep;"[179] 3. from an old English Ballad: "Though they come in sheep's clothing, let their talk be in vain; For ravening Wolves inwards ye shall prove them plaine;"[180] 4. Greene: "These two . . . had . . . under their sheepes skinnes hidden their bloudie nature of a wolfe.;"[181] 5. Nash:

176 *Physicians' Tale,* C 101. Chaucer was very likely translating Alanus de Insulis, "Sub molli pastore capit lanam lupus, et grex Incustoditus dilaceratur eo," (*Liber Parabolarum,* I. 31).

177 *Flowers of Epigrammes* (1577), ed. Spenser Society, 1874, p. 109.

178 Ed. 1815, p. 292 of vol. I (*C. T. Drusus,* st. 5).

179 *Petite Pallace,* etc. (1576), ed. I. Gollancz, London, 1908, I. 166. Cited by M. P. Tilley, *op. cit.,* pp. 332-333.

180 H. E. Rollins, *Old English Ballads* (Cambridge, U. S. A., 1930), p. 67.

181 *Works,* ed. Grosart, III. ll. (1584). Cited by Apperson, *op. cit.,* pp. 70-71.

"They are called Wolves . . . to kill the Sheepe;"[182] 6. *Sir John Oldcastle:* "If ever woolfe were clothed in sheepes coate, Then I am he;"[183] 7. Shakspere: "Thee I'll chase hence, thou wolf in sheep's array;"[184] and, "Is he a lamb? his skin is surely lent him, For he's inclined as is the ravenous wolf. Who cannot steal a shape that mean deceit?"[185]

There is no dearth of maxims connected with the fable in question, from Terence ("to set the wolf to keep the sheep")[186] down to modern times. The familiar adage is found in the early (c. 1460) play, *Wisdom* (sc. 3, st. 61), and in Barclay's *Ship of Fools* (1509, II. 7).[187] Erasmus has it in his *Adagia* (II. 155 C): *Ovum lupo commisisti,* and John Heywood's *Proverbs* (28), gives it as "A wolf in sheep's skin," agreeing with Florio's "Wolf lapt in a sheep's skin,"[188] and in a different version: "The death of the wolf is the health of the sheep,"[189] while the lexicographer, Cotgrave, lists the saying, "A bad dog hates to looke upon the wolfe,"[190]—clearly derived from the fable. Another form of the proverb reads: "He that makes himself a sheep shall be eaten of the wolves."

VIII. *The Grasshopper in Winter* (October Eclogue, ll. 11-12).

> "Such pleasaunce makes the grasshopper so poore,
> And ligge so layd, when winter doth her straine."

The ant, as W. L. Renwick says, is implied in the preceding two lines of the poem. So common is this fable that Spenser hardly needed to go to Mantuan for it, though his

182 Ed. McKerrow, I. 93.
183 V. ii. 160-161 (1600).
184 *1 Henry VI.* I. iii. 55.
185 *2 Henry VI.* III. i. 77-79. Cf. the lines in the Mother Goose rime: "O, fie on wolves that march in masking clothes, For to devour the lambs, when shepherd sleeps." (Katherine E. Thomas, *The Real Personages of Mother Goose,* Boston, 1930, p. 91). This fable is a hardy plant; it is used in 1704, London, as the title of a tract against Dissenters, "The Wolf stript of his Shepherd's cloathing," by Charles Leslie. And see the Preface to Thackeray's *Newcomes.*
186 *Eun.* V. i. 16.
187 Apperson, *ibid.*
188 *Second Fruites* (1591), 171.
189 *First Fruites* (1578), fo. 31.
190 1611, s. v. *Loup.* For the proverb "A wolf may not change his heart," see M. P. Tilley, *op. cit.,* p. 346, who cites Massinger, *The City Madam,* V iii. 494; "'Tis not in a wolf to change his nature." Draxe has "A wolf in lamb's skin," (415, 2201), and "A man must not make a wolf a shepherd" (421, 2448). See, Max Foerster, "Das Elizabethanische Sprichwort nach Th. Drax's Treasurie, 1616" *Anglia,* XLII (1918), 361 ff.; also Thomas Draxe, *Bibliotheca Scholastica instructissima, or A Treasurie of ancient Adagies* (London, 1654).

indebtedness to the Latin pastoralist cannot be denied.[191] Our poet makes excellent use of the homely bit of fable, raising it to the level of high art in his inspired October Eclogue. Its literary descent antedates that of all other recorded fables, since it forms the theme of one of Hesiod's couplets in the *Shield of Heracles* describing the grasshopper singing during the summer. Its use as an exhortation to diligence and a reproof to idleness is as old as Solomon[193] and the Persian Saadi; as a parable it is without compeer to illustrate the difference between the industrious and the slothful. Its interest is perennial:[194] St. Ambrose employs the cicada as the emblem of the man who passes his life in indifference and pleasures, and a few years ago Walt Disney turned to the subject to produce one of his best sound-pictures.

In English, Geffrey Whitney[195] chooses the theme of "Ants and Grasshoppers" for his Emblem 159; Fleming (1576) relates a fable of the grasshopper and the ant,[196] as does Greene, who substitles it "A conceited Fable of the Olde Comedian Aesop,"[197] while Shakspere makes the Fool in *King Lear* say: "We'll set thee to school to an ant, to teach thee there's no labouring in winter." (II. iv. 61). The play of *The Raigne of King Edward III* (pub. 1596) includes the lines:

> "I, so the Grashopper doth spend the time
> In mirthfull iollitie, till winter come;
> And then too late he would redeeme his time
> When frozen cold hath nipt his carelesse head."

---

191 Mantuan's Eclogue V. 21-2, 28-9, 31, 35-7, W. L. Renwick, *ed. cit.*, p. 216: "Spenser returns an *ant* for the *grasshopper* of Mantuan and Aesop."

192 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, I. 29: "Hesiod's The Nightingale is the oldest fable."

193 *Proverbs*, 6:6; 20:4.

194 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, II. 123; I. 251, for list of analogues. Robert, *op. cit.*, I. 1-4, a list of analogues, Oriental, Greek, Latin, French and Italian. A. Delboulle, *op. cit.*, (Paris, 1891), pp. 3-7, who gives the reference to St. Ambrose, *Epist. VI. ad Irenaeum.* Kenneth McKenzie, "Italian Fables in Verse" PMLA (1906), p. 273, for further references. Professor McKenzie points out that the fable is inserted by Benvenuto da Imola in his commentary on Dante (*Inf.* III.. 30, Florence, 1887, I. p. iii). Verdizotti's volume has a woodcut at p. 139; Perrière's Emblem (101) is reproduced in Henry Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers*, p. 303; Baif's verses on the theme are reprinted by Warner F. Patterson, *Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory* (Ann Arbor, 1935), I. 406 and 645. St.-Marc Girardin, *LaFontaine et les Fabulistes*, (Paris, 1882), pp. 406 ff.

195 *Choice of Emblemes*, ed. Green, p. 149.

196 *Panopl. Epist.* 227, cited in N. E. D.

197 *The Plays and Poems by R. Greene*, ed. J. C. Collins (Oxford, 1905), pp. 316-18, of volume 2.

IX. *The Nightingale and the Titmouse* (November Eclogue, ll. 25-26).

"The nightingale is sovereigne of song,
Before him sits the titmouse silent bee."

The possible origin of this proverbial expression may be traced to the fable of "The Nightingale and the Sparrow-hawk,"[198] but the relationship is distant; more directly it goes back to "The Peacock and the Nightingale,"[199] in which the peacock complains to June that it cannot sing like the other bird. Spenser's lines, however, are a translation of a couplet by Clément Marot:

"Le rossignol de chanter est le maistre,
Taire convient devant luy les pivers."[200]

Perhaps Spenser's version led Edward Fairfax to write in one of his Eclogues:

"The other groomes that heard, hid in the dales,
Were dume for shame, like conquered nightingales."[201]

In its proverbial form the antithesis of nightingale and titmouse is well-phrased in one of Gascoigne's poems:

"sometimes I wepe
To see Tom Tyttimouse so much set by."[202]

This concludes our study of the fables in *The Shepheardes Calender*. We discover that the genre belonged by right to the pastoral, because of the tradition originating in classical and later Latin literatures as revived by "the new poets" in France and England, and because the fable served for Spenser the same use as did the antiquated and dialectical speech of several of the Eclogues: they all accentuated the native, homely effects proper to the pastoral. Moreover, by means of the fable Spenser was able to discuss matters of contemporary moment which, uttered in plain terms, would have been both inadvisable and unsafe.

[*To be continued*]

---

198 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, I. 244 (analogues); II. 72.

199 *Idem* I. 249 (analogues); II. 105. Robert, *op. cit.*, I. 149-150. Cf *Muiop.*, 95: "Nor Junoes bird in her ey-spotted traine."

200 *De Madame Loyse de Savoye, Mere du Roye, en forme d'Eglogue* (1531), ll. 28-29, the poem which Spenser takes as a model for his November Eclogue. See, C. H. Herford, *ed. cit.*, p. 183.

201 *Hermes and Lycaon, ed. cit.*, p. 3.

202 *Complainct of Phylomene* (1576), ll. 26-27, cited by Herford and by *NED.* The latter (*s. vi* titmouse, 3) says that the word was used by Nash and others of the time in the sense of "a small, petty, or insignificant person or thing." A somewhat different form of the proverb appears as "when the owl sings, the nightingale will hold her peace." See Nicholas Breton, "Packet of Mad Letters" (1603), in *Works*, 1879, II. 12.

RECURRENT POETIC THEME

"It is a theme as fluent as the sea"
(*Henry V,* III, vii, 35)

By MAX I. BAYM

THE assiduous reader of poetry—if there be such in these days of bitter prose—is undoubtedly familiar with this recurrent poetic theme: the poet's bestowal of immortality on the object of his affections through his verses.

In the course of literary elaboration, this idea (or *mood-form*) had finally assumed a fairly fixed mold of expression. The pattern is this: When you are old, my dear, and I am gone, take down my book of verses and recall how ardently I loved you once.

Literary coupling of love with death is a creative composite which has its roots, of course, in the literature of antiquity and flourishes extensively in the Renaissance, especially in the heaving whelm of Sonnet literature. After the cooling influence of the 18th century Rationalism the pattern revives again during the Romantic period and is far from having been dissipated in the 20th century. Thus, Ernest Dowson, in his *In Tempore Senectutis* sings:

> When I am old,
> And sadly steal apart,
> Into the dark and cold,
> Friend of my heart!
> Remember, if you can,
> Not him who lingers, but that other man,
> Who loved and sang, and had a beating heart,—
> When I am old! [etc.]

And William Butler Yeats, in his well known sonnet:

> When you are old and gray and full of sleep,
> And nodding by the fire, take down this book,
> And slowly read, and dream of the soft look
> Your eyes had once [etc.]

But Yeats's sonnet sends us back to the 16th century and the *Amours* of Ronsard, especially to his by now very familiar sonnet:

> Quand vous serez bien vieille, au soir è la chandelle,
> Assise aupres du feu, devidant et filant,
> Direz chantant mes vers, en vous esmerveillant,
> Ronsard me celebroit du temps que j'estois belle [etc.]

Incidentally, it is interesting to get the feel of this sonnet in the English garb lent to it by Andrew Lang:

> When you are very old, at evening,
> You'll sit and spin beside the fire and say,
> Humming my songs, "Ah well, ah well-a-day,
> When I was young of me did Ronsard sing [etc.]

From a juxtaposition of some relatively modern poems (Dowson's and Yeats's, for instance) with that of Ronsard's sonnet, one might naturally be led to conclude that the modern poet has read Ronsard and remembered him perhaps too well in the expression of his own dreams and emotions. But need he necessarily have gone to a French poet for the re-elaboration of the pattern in question? Was there not, perhaps, some great English bard—a contemporary of Ronsard—whose verses have subconsciously awakened in our modern English writing poet the emotion for which the older poet has already furnished the verbal form?

In brief, the possible bard we are referring to is none other than Shakspere. Everyone knows Meres's reference in his *Palladis Tamia* (1598) to the Bard's "sugred Sonnets among his private friends". An examination of these reveals that, if no other, at least *Sonnets* 2, 12, 32, 71 and 72 contain something of the spirit of the schematic pattern we have given above. Thus, No. 2:

> When forty winters shall besiege thy brow,
> And dig deep trenches in thy beauty's field,
> Thy youth's proud livery, so gaz'd on now,
> Will be a tatter'd weed, of small worth held;
> Then being ask'd where all thy beauty lies [etc.]

Sonnet 12, to be sure, has less relevance, except in its initial 'spurt':

> When I do count . . .
> When I behold the violet past prime
> . . .
> Then of thy beauty [etc.]

In *Sonnet* 32, we come nearer the theme:

> . . .
> When that churl Death my bones with dust shall cover,
> And shalt by fortune once more re-survey
> These poor rude lines of thy deceasëd lover
> . . .
> Reserve them for my love, not for their rhyme [etc.].

Here, in this last quotation, we have approached, in spirit and essential meaning, the content and mood-form of Ronsard's sonnet. But let us look further.

Even while our Poet's sonnets were privately circulating among his friends, and undoubtedly making a hit, *King Richard II* made its appearance (in 1597). Towards the end of the play, the deposed Richard is on his way to the Tower. The Queen and her ladies have come to see him pass. Presently he appears. Whereupon the Queen says:

> Thou map of honour, thou King Richard's tomb,
> And not King Richard . . . etc.

And the deposed king replies:

> Join not with grief, fair woman, do not so—
> *Learn, good soul,*
> *To think our former state a happy dream;*
> From which awak'd, the truth of what we are
> Shows us but this.

Now, in metre and tone and emotional implication, these words (especially those I have italicised) at least glimpse the pattern in question, for which we take the opening lines of Ronsard's sonnet as the model. But, let us proceed a bit further with Shakspere's text. The Queen chides Richard for having submitted too easily to Bolingbroke:

> The lion dying thrusteth forth his paw,
> And wounds the earth, if nothing else, with rage
> To be o'erpower'd; and wilt thou . . . mildly kiss the rod
> And fawn on rage with base humility,
> Which art a lion and a king of beasts?

King Richard:

> A king of beasts, indeed; if aught but beasts
> I had been still a happy king of men.
> Good sometimes queen, prepare thee hence for France.

What follows in this speech represents a definite change from an idea communicated to a passion chanted.

> *Think I am dead,* and that even here thou tak'st—
> As from my death-bed—thy last living leave.
> *In winter's tedious nights sit by the fire*
> *With good old folks and let them tell thee tales*

Of woeful ages long ago betid;
And ere thou bid good night, to quit their griefs
Tell thou the lamentable tale of me
And send the hearers weeping to their beds.

Obviously we have here a lyrical intermezzo in which —particularly the *italicised* portion—the Ronsard motif and manner are absolutely evident. (Incidentally, the lyrical intermezzo has, in Shakspere's plays, very frequently the sonnet-tone.)

In the arts, especially in poetry, painting, and music, the recurrence of what might be called soul-matter (or, mood-form) clothed in a crystallized mold or pattern, is quite natural; and he who mistakes this recurrence for a plagiarism fails to understand the ambient nature of the creative particles in the atmosphere of art tradition. Nevertheless, one is always privileged to ask, What atmosphere did a given artist breathe in at the time that he assimilated, and turned to his own uses, a given art-pattern? For instance, here we have a passage in one poet that definitely carries on the very spirit of another. Now, the atmosphere in which Shakspere wrought his sonnets was that of imitation and assimilation (1), where "the heavy debt to classical Italian and French effort is unmistakable". (2) Whether Shakspere knew Italian or no, his awareness of Petrarch is made manifest when he says 'Now is he for the numbers that Petrarch flowed in: Laura, to his lady," etc. But that he had more than a mere awareness of the French language in which Ronsard wrote his sonnets is more than hinted at: the characters in *Henry V,* for instance, are actually made to speak it. Thus, the Bard may very well have read the *Amours* of Ronsard, who put foot on English soil more than once. If so, the French echoes turn into unmistakable 'sweet English music'.

Hunter College,
New York, N. Y.

(1) *Vide* Sir Sidney Lee's *'A Life of Wm. Shakespeare'*, p. 170.
(2) *Ibid, loc. cit.*

NOTES AND COMMENTS

on

Henry IV, Part I, Variorum Edition

By GEORGE C. TAYLOR

SOMEONE rather jocularly observed recently that with a certain mythical University employing almost any sort of person to go out and "get" the fellow who publishes a book issuing from the Press of any other university, what purports to be a review nowadays becomes interesting rather as a matter of billingsgate than as an aid to the ascertainment of humanistic truth. The comments which follow are intended to serve, if possible, the latter purpose.

The recent Variorum edition of *Henry IV,* Part I, is in many respects a noble achievement in Shaksperian scholarship. Nowhere else, certainly not in any one volume, is it possible for the student of Shakspere to find as valuable a body of scholarly opinion and literary criticism in regard to this, in many respects, the most important play Shakspere ever wrote. To publish the best edition in existence any scholar would be glad to have to his credit.

Any Variorum edition of a Shakspere play done by any one man could be a better book. It is to this reviewer doubtful whether a Variorum edition of a Shakspere play should any longer be done by any one scholar. Like a great dictionary it is rather the task for a group of scholars or for an institution. In order that the next Variorum of a play may be a better book even than this one, it is therefore fitting that any scholar that considers himself more or less of a specialist of *Henry IV,* Part I, should now come forward and make his own little contribution of critical suggestions and notes.

My suggestions are as follows:

P. 13, l. 34 (I, i). *Hot . . . question.* Glossed "hotly discussed." It would be better to find a gloss which would fit into Shakspere's syntax. "Being hotly discussed" is preferable.

P. 15, l. 58 (I, i). *Shape of likelihood.* Not glossed; this phrase needs a gloss much more than many others

glossed. It means "evidence that made it seem likely" that a battle was being fought.

P. 15, l. 60 (I, i). *Pride.* The gloss "height" is excellent, but means little unless "pride" is explained as a figure from falconry and supplemented by its most celebrated use in Shakspere in *Macbeth,* II, iv, 12, "A falcon towering in her pride of place."

P. 20, ll. 78-90 (I, i). Hudson is cited as to the unity of the play coming from the character of the Prince of Wales and his wonderful change from rake to a kingly person. Robert A. Law's article cited in the bibliography surely should be cited here as the only article in recent years which attempts to find a principle of unity in *Henry IV.*

P. 23, l. 99 (I, i). *Crest.* Referred to in the gloss cited as "feathers on an animal's head"! "Feathers on an animal's head" sounds rather strange. The figure is obviously that of a fighting cock with feathers at the base of his comb, ruffled as he fights. "Crested cock" is a commonplace in Elizabethan poetry. The word "bristles" in the Shakspere passage is, of course, associated with the hair raised on a dog's back as he begins his fight. It is a mixed metaphor. "Prune" (l. 98) and "bristles" are used by Shakspere in one line here, the first, of course, associated in our minds with the image of a bird, the second, with the image of a dog. The interesting language-problem connected with the lines lies in the word "crest." Was that word then (as now) used only of birds, or used also of the top of a dog's head? In Shakspere "crest" certainly may be used of a dog, as the following passage, most pertinent to the passage under discussion here, shows:

> Now for the bare-pick'd bone of majesty
> Doth doggëd war bristle his angry crest.
> —*King John,* IV, iii, 148-149.

P. 24, l. 107 (I, i). *Out of Anger.* Not glossed. Because of I, iii, 51, *out of grief,* it would be well to gloss this as "in my present mood of anger."

P. 25, l. 4 (I, ii). *Benches.* Not glossed. It means privy holes. See *Antony and Cleopatra,* IV, vii, 9, "We'll beat em into bench holes."

P. 52, ll. 5-6 (I, iii). *I will from henceforth rather be myself, mighty and to be feared.* A long note leaves us still in doubt at the end, though a simple gloss, such as the following, might clear it up: "I too, like the rest of you, will be (unlike my true self) mighty and to be feared." In this connection the editor here takes occasion to remark that Edward Capell expresses himself more awkwardly and obscurely than any of the other editors of Shakspere, and then proceeds throughout the rest of the volume to cite him more often than any other writer by way of elucidating Shakspere's language.

P. 59, l. 52 (I, iii). *Neglectingly.* Glossed "negligently." Hotspur himself twelve lines below glosses this as "indirectly, as I said." It means "inattentively, absentmindedly."

P. 60, l. 77 (I, iii). *Yet.* This is one of the best instances in Shakspere of what Kittredge and others call the "strong *yet.*" The passage is obscure without this emphasis.

P. 67, l. 101 (I, iii). *Hardiment.* Glossed, as by Steevens, "hardiness" and "bravery." But neither of these lines fits the context. "Changing hardiness and bravery" does not make sense. The passage means: He spent ("counfounded") the best part of an hour exchanging mighty blow for blow with Glendower.

P. 75, l. 201 (I, iii). No editor today follows the quarto in the matter of giving these lines to Northumberland. They are certainly spoken by Hotspur. A footnote, as in other matters like this in this volume, should indicate this.

P. 83, l. 261 (I, iii). *Meane.* Not glossed. It should be glossed as "agent" or "go-between."

P. 84, l. 278 (I, iii). *Still.* Glossed as meaning "always." It should have been glossed as such where it first appears, in line 226, especially as its meaning there is more significant for the interpretation of the Shakspere sense of the passage.

P. 86, l. 4 (II, i). *Anon.* Not glossed. It should be. It means, as in almost all of its uses in this play, "Coming right now."

P. 95, l. 66 (II, i, 77). *Trojans.* Surely something needs to be said here about the preference of the Elizabethans

for the Trojans as against the Greeks in Elizabethan drama.

P. 101, l. 85 (II, i, 96). *Fernseed.* There is no allusion here to the important matter of medicinal botanies as the basis of a very large body of stimulating and decorative figures of speech in Shakspere and many other Elizabethan dramatists.

P. 102, l. 93 (II, i, 106). *Muddy.* Glossed as "thick-witted." But in both parallel passages cited in corroboration it means only "low, dirty, brutish."

P. 109, l. 82 (II, ii, 94). *Store.* This certainly needs to be glossed, as those being robbed certainly have some of their store with them on the trip. It means, as Kittredge said, "all they have."

P. 117, l. 38 (II, iii, 42). *Banisht—bed.* The editor permits himself to be drawn into the most dangerous and treacherous of all the wild conjectural trends of present day Elizabethan scholarship, the desperate attempt to find allusions in the Elizabethan drama to Essex, who was after all only one of many exceedingly popular and spectacular supermen of his times. The movement has become for scholarship today the Essex scourge. There are so many ladies in all ages troubled by husbands who absent themselves provokingly often that it seems entirely unnecessary to resort here to "our gracious general" in order to explain the passage.

P. 117, l. 48 (II, iii, 52). *Manage* needs a gloss more than "golden" in line 40. It is a technical term of horsemanship.

P. 129-135, ll. 34-99 (II, iv, 49-125). The editor temperamentally registers his personal impression in regard to the nature of the humor of the scene in which Hal teases the "drawer" or waiter, Francis, as follows:

> "To the modern reader the dramatic function of this episode seems apparent; the drunken buffoonery of the prince is used, hilarious as it is, as a foil to the brilliant and imaginative humor of Falstaff."

The prince is neither drunken nor a buffoon. Shakspere could not represent a Prince of Wales drunk on the Elizabethan stage. Manly (*Shakspere Himself*) selects this scene as one of the best illustrations of Shakspere's vigorous humor at its apex. Take the prince out and most of the

vigor would be lost. When sociological sympathy for the underdog shuts us off from Shakspere's greatest humor we are in a bad fix. It might possibly have been more to the point to notice at this point, more naturally than at any other point, how, in an age delighting in word-play and "words, words, words," Francis perhaps struck the Elizabethan audience as having a smaller vocabulary than any other in Shakspere, or, as Hal puts it, "His eloquence is the parcel of reasoning." Costard in *Loves Labours Lost* with his "remuneration" is a World of Words to Francis.

P. 135-152, ll. 100-258 (II, iv, 126-133). Apparently with sociological bias, the editor quotes in connection with the prince's jest at the expense of Francis, Lloyd (*Essays on Shakspere,* 1854) to the effect that the prince as a deviser of jests (devices) is even stupider than Poins. He has already used the expression "drunken buffoon" as to Hal, the "dull foil" for Falstaff. The prince is, of course, meant by Shakspere to be a very clever, likable young fellow, entirely worthy of Falstaff's steel, who is capable of driving Falstaff into a corner for the purpose of giving us the delight of seeing Falstaff fence his way out. He gives as good as he gets in wit combat—almost. No one, of course, is as witty as Falstaff, but to compare the prince to the sorriest person by all odds in the play, Poins, who but for the prince and Falstaff's wit, would have stuck his dagger into Falstaff's "fat paunch," as he calls it, because he can't take a joke (II, iv, 159-160), indicates to what a desperate pass sociological bias can take a good scholar in these piping times of peace.

P. 134, l. 82 (II, iv, 104). *I am now of all humors.* It is difficult to see how one can avoid commenting on Jacques' (*As You Like It*) best known of all the passages on his humor "compounded from many simples," and the preoccupation of the Elizabethan dramatists in 1598 with the humor plays of Jonson and Chapman.

P. 135, l. 90 ff. (II, iv, 114). The play improvised by Falstaff and Hal, and directed by Falstaff in the tavern, surely calls for comment on improvizing on the Elizabethan stage and a citation from Thornton Shirley Graves on that subject, (*Studies in Philology,* Oct., 1922), and the great book by Baskerville, *The Elizabethan Jig.* Miss Winifred

Smith and Katharine Lea on the Commedia del Arte are surely of more scholarly import here than a purely speculative attempt to follow the principle of association of ideas by which Hal gets from the subject of Francis to Hotspur. He is thinking rapidly and disconnectedly, but not drunkenly, about any matter that comes into his head as a lively youngster does. Nowhere else in Shakspere's plays is it so necessary to comment on the matter of extemporizing and improvizing on the Elizabethan stage. Hal abandons the idea of improvizing a play on the theme of a burlesque of Hotspur and Kate, and improvizes a play on the theme of Hal's being called to account by Henry IV, later actually treated in the body of this very play in semi-tragic vein.

P. 136, l. 106 (II, iv, 133-134). *Titan kiss a dish of butter.* Hamlet's "Being a God kissing carrion" has to be cited here. This passage helps to establish the right reading in *Hamlet.*

P. 136, l. 106 (II, iv, 133). The editor, again assuming that the prince is drunk, uses the words "in his somewhat maudlin state." But enough of this. School editions of Shakspere may in the future perpetuate this misconception.

P. 152, ll. 257-258 (II, iv, 308-309). "What shall we have a play extempore?" It should be noticed in this connection that this scene in *Henry IV,* Part I, and the scene in *Hamlet,* and the last scene in *Love's Labours Lost,* which runs to about one thousand lines, are among the three longest scenes in Shakspere—perhaps because Shakspere is talking shop, about the stage. Shakspere apparently finds it as difficult to leave off talking about "Play acting" as does Falstaff in l. 453, where, even in danger of arrest by the sheriff he cries "Out, ye rogue, play out the play." P. 168, l. 453 (II, iv, 531).

P. 171, l. 472 (II, iv, 552). *Their date is out.* The expression needs a note because, whether it means it or not in this particular connection, the same expression in *Romeo and Juliet* (I, iv, 3) means exactly what our slang expression of today, "out of date," "out of style," means.

P. 175 (III, i). The editor says that Glendower's boasting as to his supernatural powers "is not in vain from Shakspere's point of view," suggesting that Shakspere actually

believed in ghosts *et al.* It is dangerous to say with certainty that Shakspere believed in such matters. Hotspur in this play and Edmund the Bastard in Lear ridicule most effectively the entire world of the supernatural. If one must indulge in guesses, it's a better guess that there is much more of Shakspere himself in Hotspur than in Glendower.

P. 200, l. 228 (III, i, 231). The editor states very definitely, "We may safely assume that Shakspere believed in Glendower's magic powers." Is the editor following Stoll on *Shakspere's Ghosts* here? There are, as is well-known, many wild and woolly trends in Shakspere scholarship today. This sort of thing next to the Essex scourge is the wildest. The superiority complex of some of the modern scholars would make Shakspere low intellectually, lower than most of the courageous thinkers of his day, such as Montaigne and Reginald Scot, whom he read. To assume that Shakspere follows Glendower in his beliefs is just about as logical as to assume that Marlowe, the atheist, followed Faustus in his belief. The audience, by the way, doubtless had the Faustus scenes in mind as they listened to Glendower's boast: "I can call spirits from the vasty deep." See *Atheism in the English Renaissance,* George T. Buckley, University of Chicago Press, 1932.

P. 217, l. 87 (III, ii). *Vile participation.* "Evil communications corrupt good manners." "Morals" is the best gloss here.

P. 222, l 151 (III, ii). *Time.* It means "people" here, as in other passages in Shakspere.

P. 224, l. 172 (III, ii). *Advertisement.* Glossed "intelligence." But "intelligence" very often has a sinister significance, spy or go-between. Why not gloss it simply "news?"

P. 228, l. 25 ff. (III, iii, 30 ff.). *Knight of the Burning Lamp.* Inasmuch as the most celebrated burlesque in the Elizabethan drama is in the *Knight of the Burning Pestle* and involves this particular play, *Henry IV,* is it not necessary to say something at this most appropriate point about it? And as this expression is the high point of the multitudinous sea incarnadine of details as Bardolph's nose, is it not necessary to say something about this, the most extra-

ordinary elaboration of the lost art of the burlesque in Shakspere's plays?

P. 231, l. 69, (III, iii. 84). *Diet.* Not glossed. It means here, as so often in Shakspere and Elizabethan Literature, the whole matter of the regimen of life (its Latin sense), or in Falstaff's case, food and lodging.

P. 271, l. 61 (IV, ii, 72). *Food for powder.* The quotation from Sir Walter Raleigh (the modern Sir Walter, descendant of the celebrated Elizabethan) is most unfortunate and unscholarly. It is to the effect that Falstaff's use of the term "food for powder" is "pathetic, full of that metaphysical sense to which the comic and tragic are one and the same in contrast to the German use of the term, brutal, boastful, instinct with contempt for the sentiments of average humanity." This is simply a splendid example of the kind of modern criticism of Shakspere which should be "more honored in the breach than the observance," of how critics laboring under the sociological sympathy of today distort Shakspere's meaning and annihilate the robust comedy of the Elizabethans. Nothing could be farther from Falstaff's thoughts than the sentiments suggested here.

P. 275, l. 51 (IV, iii). *Suggestion.* Best glossed by the word "instigation."

P. 289, l. 60 (V, i). *Gull.* A most extraordinary use of the word "gull" in Shakspere. It almost always in Elizabethan English means the party made a fool of. Here it means the party who makes a fool of the other fellow.

P. 312, l. 33 (V, iii). *Here's no vanity.* If, as the citations and the conclusions in regard to them suggest, the "no" is used ironically, Shakspere would have written, not "here", but, as in the preceding lines, "there." The meaning is much simpler if "here" refers to Falstaff, pointing to himself, in contrast to Sir Walter Blount. Falstaff goes on to say that he (Falstaff) is not empty but heavy, as everybody knows is true. "Here no vanity" means "I am not light."

P. 326, l. 83 (V, iv). *I . . . prophecy.* The citation from *Richard II* is surely pertinent; surely even more pertinent is the passage from *Hamlet,* as to dying men having the power of prophecy:

Had I but time,—as this fell sergeant, Death,
Is strict in his arrest,—O, I could tell you—
—*Hamlet,* Act V, ii, 347 f.

and then coming to life as it were,

But I do prophecy the election lights on Fortinbras.
—Act V, ii, 366-367.

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR.

The University
of North Carolina.

YON POMEGRANATE TREE

"Nightly she sings on yon pomegranate tree,"
The nightingale of Juliet's starry view,
Whose notes, vibrant forever, swell to me
Triumphant love—death, gloriously new:
As if the crowd in fair Verona's town
Gazed still at lips red as pomegranate flower,
Red, red as Tybalt's blood, and soft as down
Of bed which mocked her clamorous nuptial hour.

In land far off the blossom sings her doom,
Where mocking birds lost in the dusky leaves
With muted midnight softness pierce the gloom
To lessen pain to him who, lonely, grieves.
The fruit's rich dye repeats the petal's hue,
Red to the heart, ripe death, eternal true.

GRACE WARREN LANDRUM.

GRANVILLE-BARKER'S HAMLET

By Robert M. Smith

GRANVILLE-BARKER'S third volume of *Prefaces to Shakespeare,* which is wholly devoted to *Hamlet,* comes as a welcome assurance that not for all Englishmen has Professor Dover Wilson said the final word in *What Happens in Hamlet?* Though at every reference to his predecessor Granville-Barker doffs a hat in respectful obeisance, he does not succumb to Professor Wilson's bibliographical and textual wiles, nor to his phantasies of interpretation.

A modest disclaimer to any pretensions to bibliographical or textual competence seems to be substantiated by certain casual and inaccurate statements, such as that about Rowe's editorship. On page 15 he asserts that Rowe "picks and chooses between Q2 and F1." Dr. G. C. Dawson of the Folger Library, who has made a careful study of Rowe's texts, can demonstrate that for *Hamlet* Rowe consulted neither Q2 nor F1, but printed his text from F4 and the Betterton Quarto of 1703. Rowe's act and scene divisions, it is true, represent Restoration theatrical practice; and Granville-Barker does for *Hamlet* the salutary service he performed in *Prefaces First* and *Second Series* for *Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra, King Lear* and other plays. He brings to Shakspere criticism the point of view of an experienced and successful dramatic manager and playwright. What he lacks in academic scholarship, he amply makes up for by reinterpreting Shakspere's plays in terms of vital dramatic movements on the stage. He thus supplies the necessary corrective to the philosophical approach of an A. C. Bradley, who, like his predecessors of the Romantic school, Coleridge, Hazlitt, DeQuincy, assumed that the tragedies were flawless works of organic design: "to be studied," as De Quincy puts it, "with the entire submission of our own faculties, and in the perfect faith that in them there can be no too much or too little, nothing useless or inert—but that the further we press in our discoveries, the more we shall see proofs of design and self-supporting arrangement where the careless eye had seen nothing but accident." Bradley, it is true, notably in *King Lear,* is sorely puzzled by the numerous inconsistencies and inac-

curacies of character, time, and place, which he can explain only by charging them to Shakspere's careless art. Granville Barker demonstrates that none of these discrepancies would have been apparent to Shakspere's audience. It is only the closet scholar poring over the text with microscopic eye who discovers them; Shakspere, if he ever thought of them, knew they would pass his audience unobserved. Under Granville-Barker's keen eye for dramatic movement and significance *King Lear, Antony and Cleopatra,* and now *Hamlet,* are shown to be not unfitted for the theatre, as Hazlit and Lamb were wont to complain, but enthralling presentations when properly staged—free ranging in time and space, and therefore allowing scope for Shakspere's dramatic imagination. Gone, henceforth, are the efforts of Daniel to measure Shaksperian time by the stop-watch, gone the mistaken efforts of the Restoration to cut up the movement of a Shakspere tragedy into scenes at every change of place. One of the critic's most valuable contributions is his repeated demonstration that Shakspere wrote for an essentially timeless and unlocalized stage, his interests being primarily concerned with effective tempo and dramatic movement, rather than with consistent clock time. The clock and the calendar are not absent, but are merely among the means by which the whole dramatic movement is made expressive. Instead of treating *Hamlet,* therefore, as a tragedy of five acts, divisions which have no textual warrant, Granville-Barker divides the play into three dramatic "movements" —the first coinciding with the usual first act, the second extending from Reynaldo's departure for France to Hamlet's voyage to England, the third from the news of Ophelia's madness to the end.

As to Hamlet's madness, he believes the melancholy Dane has spells when he is "punished with sore distraction." He dismisses, however, all alienist diagnoses by saying, quite truly, that Shakspere does not think in such terms. Like Hamlet, Shakspere speaks in riddles. "There is pretended madness mixed with real madness and not always easily distinguished; the reality and the riddle of it is Shakespeare's addition to the old story and its pretense, and is the leaven which, lifting the character above the story's needs, gives the play its enduring significance."

Hamlet's doubt of the Ghost is genuine; when the Ghost

is present he is convinced that it is his father's spirit, when the experience is only a memory he questions, as he questions everything, whether it may have been a devil. With Dover Wilson, Granville-Barker holds that to Shakspere's audience Hamlet's doubts about the Ghost would seem quite natural; it is not until Hamlet catches Claudius in the mousetrap that Hamlet is convinced. The Ghost, as well as Claudius, is on trial during the play within the play.

As to the respective guilt of the Queen and Claudius: Gertrude shares with Claudius their secret, the adultery; the deadlier one of murder he keeps from her. She is tented to the quick in the play scene because of her adultery and hasty marriage; Claudius's conscience is caught when Lucianus proceeds to poison the Player King.

The major problem of delay, dramatically necessary to have the play at all, Shakspere solved by picturing in great detail "inaction in the hero in terms of action." Granville Barker departs here from the minority school of Stoll, which views Hamlet as a man of action, impeded by external causes, who, nevertheless, strikes in time, an interpretation which can be maintained only by minimizing or ignoring the plain intent of the soliloquies, and by slighting other direct evidences, such as those in the Closet Scene when the Ghost answers Hamlet's guilty question:

> *H.* Do you not come your tardy son to chide,
> That, laps'd in time and pasion, lets go by
> The important acting of your dread command?
>
> *G.* Do not forget: this visitation
> Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose.

It is unlikely, therefore, that the Stoll interpretation of *Hamlet* can prevail against Hamlet's repeated references to his lapsed purpose, and the Ghost's corroboration of it.

By rejecting this truncated *Hamlet,* and accepting to the full the motivation of delay by character defect, Granville-Barker draws a sympathetic and plausible interpretation of the young prince. Hamlet is referring to himself when he speaks of the overgrowth of some complexion which can even break down the pales and forts of reason, and of the one defect which may destroy all the other qualities in a

man, namely his tendency to weakness and melancholy. "He takes refuge from his emotions in the labyrinth of his mind." His doubts are self-defensive doubts. Shock and strain have produced an apathy of will that leaves the mind more active, nakedly sensitive, preternaturally clear. From the disequilibrium comes this "madness"; the mind falls sick too, of a fever. Feeling, faith, intellect, and will are dislocated and at war; Hamlet is "at odds not merely with the ills of this world, but within himself, and cannot but be impotent so."

As to the problem of the Dumb-Show, over which critics have warred for many years, Granville-Barker flatly rejects the brilliant but super-subtle interpretation which Dover Wilson builds upon the flimsy and arbitrary assumption that Cladius did not observe it. On the contrary, it is a calculated insult which has immediate effect on both King and Queen, but it is only the beginning of a long, tense, deliberate struggle to break down the King's composure, which finally collapses "on the talk of the poisoning." Had Claudius been subject, as Dover Wilson contends, merely to the culminating blow, he might well have faced it out. It is his prolonged effort at dissimulation that finally collapses. Granville-Barker's dramatic experience serves him well when disposing of Dover Wilson's further contentions that the Dumb-Show, "the posy-prologue", Lucianus's "damnable faces", etc., are deliberate betrayals of the Players of Hamlet's plan. Shakspere, he says, would never "dissipate the force of such a scene by so dividing its interest, or handicap Hamlet at this juncture with a quite extraneous difficulty. Besides, there is literally nothing in the play which is not, in some way or other, germane to its story or illustrative of Hamlet's character, or a consequence, direct or indirect, of what he does or leaves undone. Such an irrelevancy as this betrayal of his plan by the players, springing from nothing, leading nowhere, would be a rift in the fabric, and dramatically meaningless."

Granville-Barker similarly rejects Dover Wilson's interpretation of the Nunnery Scene, which "robs the scene of all the ebb and flow of tenderness and regret, and makes Hamlet merely a self-righteous scold." The old stage-tradition should be followed, according to which Hamlet

becomes aware of the presence of Polonius and the King just before his inconsequent question to Ophelia:

> "Where's your father?"

followed by her clumsy, fearful lie.

Finally the poor waterfly, Osric, is redeemed from Wilson's accusations of treachery and complicity with Laertes in managing the foils: "Shakespeare does not do these things; he does not introduce a ridiculous fribble, and by one *ex post facto* hint in the text convert him to a scoundrel."

With Granville-Barker's study *Hamlet* criticism returns to normal.

Lehigh University,
Bethlehem, Pa.

MR. GRANVILLE-BARKER AND *HAMLET*

By R. W. Babcock

MR. GRANVILLE-BARKER'S latest *Preface,*[1] *to Hamlet,* is a curious compound of historical brilliancy (in the use of ideas sometimes, to be sure, not originally his own) and of impressionistic and bibliographical uncertainties. So long as he sticks to his own histrionic experience and derives from it, with the help of some considerable historical knowledge, theatrical conclusions about Shakspere's manipulations of his actors, he is on fairly safe ground, but when he steps aside recklessly to offer personal commentary on characterizations and on textual problems, he becomes either startlingly inconsistent or futilely pedagogical. And one does not like to see such a man pedagogical.

The book, roughly speaking, is divided into three main parts. The first discusses Shakspere's art in general, the second the three movements of the play (the critic will have nothing to do with act division) in their relation to this art, and the third the characters of the play as he thinks Shakspere meant them to be played. Interspersed between the second and third divisions appear some brief remarks on the text of the first Quarto and on Shakspere's use of verse and prose. The critic's purpose is frankly stated in the Preface: "I wanted, before I ended this series, to study one play thoroughly—as thoroughly, that is to say, as I could from the point of view I have adopted, which is to try to look at Shakespeare's dramatic art in the light of the effect which he, surmisedly, meant to make by it.[2] The subsequent three hundred and twenty-nine pages do their best to fulfill it.

The first problem is to show that, though Shakspere may have lacked art in the Jonsonian sense, he was nevertheless "the genius of the workshop"[3]—that is, that he had a few good tricks of his own which his experience as an actor could adapt to the creation of characters for the actors of his own company. Shakspere knew "just what sort of ma-

[1] Published in London by Sidgwick and Jackson, 1937.
[2] P. v.
[3] P. 2.

terial to give to the actors of his characters,"[4] but he also knew enough not to "try to do for the actor what the actor [could] do as well, and better, for himself."[5] This is perhaps the main point of the book, this idea that Shakspere provided in the lines of the play what the English critic time and again calls "stage directions"[6] for the actors, which they themselves, with their own individualities, should go ahead and interpret further. But Shakspere should not let his poetic rhetoric, or the metaphysics of character, unbalance the actor's task. Nevertheless, this is precisely what did happen in the characterization of Hamlet. Shakspere, however, "never . . . made this mistake again,"[7] and after all, the result even in *Hamlet* "stands the test of performance,"[8] which is always Mr. Granville-Barker's ultimate test.

Other theatrical tricks of Shakspere's art are the fluidity of movement of the action of the plays—the critic has thrown out act divisions—and, in the case of *Hamlet,* for example, the dramatic use of Time and Place. Mr. Granville Barker rejects the conventional act divisions because "the full effect will be lost if the continuity is broken;"[9] he will discus the play in terms of three "movements", not five acts at all. Then, again, he points out that Shakspere deliberately ignored the calendar—that is, he omitted references to Time—whenever Hamlet was inactive and, so to speak, "turned on" the Time again when Hamlet was active—using vagueness of Time throughout as a dramatic aid to characterization[10] (this vagueness, incidentally, disposes of any worry about Hamlet's precise age).[11] And, similarly, Shakspere concentrated on Unity of Place, Elsinore, with many references to traveling in the play, to give more point to Hamlet's distinct inactivity—another dramatic trick.[12] These ideas may or may not be acceptable, but they at least show Mr. Granville-Barker's method in in-

[4] There is of course nothing particularly new about this idea. Mr. T. W. Baldwin espoused it thoroughly some years ago.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] Cf. pp. 242 and 246 for the best illustrations.
[7] P. 12.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] P. 18.
[10] Note pp. 26, 27, 31, 32, 280n, 301n.
[11] Pp. 29n-30n. But compare Gertrude's age, p. 283.
[12] See especially p. 23.

terpreting the play from Shakspere's own point of view as an actor-dramatist.

The three movements of the play (the first ends with Act I, and the second with the Fortinbras scene in Act IV) we should be inclined to treat in detail only with reference to the critic's emphasis on the historically theatrical aspects of the play. Time and again—generally in long footnotes—Mr. Granville-Barker shows how Shakspere used the doors, the three stages—and the traps of his Elizabethan stage, and this mode of approach is perhaps the critic's particular *forte* in Shaksperian criticism. For instance, in the first movement, the Ghost and Hamlet "pass out through . . . the doorway on the main stage to the right,"[13] and "the Ghost will re-enter . . . upon the inner stage, Hamlet still following."[14] In the same movement: "At the Globe it is probable that the Ghost descended by a trap."[15] Finally just before the duel scene, "As the curtains of the inner stage part, the disquieted Horatio is silenced by a gesture, and there once more . . . is the sinister brilliance of Claudius and his Court." With off-stage business Mr. Granville-Barker says "we have of course no concern,"[17] but he spends two long notes[18] on the business of the sword manipulation at the end of the play. A great deal could be done with his references to the actors' tasks, the Elizabethan audience, the stage-directions, and the historical hints for producers of the play, but we have space for only a few illustrations. For instance, "an audience nowadays not only knows the story of the play, but is insensitive to some of its original significances; and actors have come to suit their reading of the parts to this. The Elizabethan Hamlet had, with his audience, reason enough for doubting whether it was, after all, 'an honest ghost' he had seen. His modern successor will seem to hold the Ghost's word for gospel and reproach himself for even momentary disbelief in it."[19] With regard to filling in the business of Laertes's revolt, "Such strokes and hints the Elizabethan actors could be trusted to colour in

[14] *Ibid.* Compare pp. 137 and 173n for use of doors.

[15] Pp. 54n-55n. There needs no ghost come from the grave to tell us this idea is not wholly new.

[16] P. 172. For further references to the three stages see pp. 19, 49, 84-5, 103n, 120n, 122, 165, 172n.

[17] P. 86n.

[18] Pp. 176n, 182n.

[19] P. 273.

and elaborate,"[20] and "An Elizabethan audience, moreover, could coordinate this and other such fragments." For individual actors the critic proceeds to suggest extra business for the interpretation of many characters of the play: for example, "If the actress of Gertrude can make us feel something of all this, I believe she will be right to do so."[22] He even takes us further: ". . . he [Shakspere] could tell the actors at rehearsal how to piece their bits together."[23] But perhaps the most interesting remark about the actors is the long note (on pages 282-3) which points out that whereas the boy actors played the girl parts, "as to the comic old women, it is likely that they were played by men."[24]—and the critic quotes W. J. Lawrence to support this contention.

Hints to producers occur throughout the book.[25] "Modern Ophelias," the critic remarks, "have an ineffective habit of drifting vaguely about the stage";[26] the gravediggers spoil a good scene by too much "mere clowning";[27] and "Laertes should leap out of Ophelia's grave, not Hamlet into it": . . . "we may have here,' he remarks, "a little history of Shakespeare's betrayal by his actors."[28] He adds that he once saw an Italian actor play the King "bibulously" throughout the play-scene so that he missed the dumb-show entirely, and offers this solution to his friend, Mr. Dover Wilson.[29] As for choice of stage-directions, the critic admits in his introductory preface that as a textual critic he has "no competence at all,"[30] so that in the book he seldom ventures into this field. He does seem to prefer the stage-directions in the Folio text,[31] and he even admits at times that the actors interpolated remarks which have come down with the text.[32] But his main theme throughout the book remains, to use his own words again, "He [Shakspere] provided music for an orchestra of living individual voices

[20] P. 143n.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] P. 119n. For other such directions see pp. 46, 65n, 119n, 186n, 251-2, 279.
[23] P. 240n.
[24] Pp. 282n-283n.
[25] See pp. 93n, 114n, 159n, 162n, 176, 182n, 273, 281-2, 282n, 292.
[26] P. 137n.
[27] P. 159n.
[28] P. 163n.
[29] P. 97n.
[30] P. v.
[31] Compare pp. 81n, 99, 121n, 172n.
[32] See pp. 59, 11, 192, 222n, 232n. There is no reference to Van Dam, however.

that he knew. As nearly as might be, he spoke through his actors."[33]

Inasmuch as the critic has thus frankly announced his professed incompetence as a textual expert, it would doubtless be unfair to tax him too heavily with his possible bibliographical uncertainties. But his further admission in his preface of his great debt to his friend, Mr. Dover Wilson lays him open, slightly at least, to something of a comparison of ideas. Here there is no doubt that Mr. Granville-Barker comes out on top, for he has rejected Mr. Wilson's wildest fantasies (the "new" stage-direction, the dumbshow interpretation, and the "sulied", for instance),[34] and he shows plenty of respect for the Folio text.[34] He even remarks about "the occasionally most useful Q1."[36] Yet he follows Dover Wilson quite slavishly on the funeral procession[37] and the fishmonger idea,[38] and even backs water a little on "sullied."[39] To Q1, as a result of his respect for it, he has devoted one whole short chapter, and here he goes considerably beyond, and even counter to, Mr. Wilson. For he says nothing about Mr. Wilson's idea of piracy of a touring company's version but boldy announces that the Corambis-Montano name-difference and the further difference in scene sequence argue that "the pirate *had* two versions of the play to pick and choose between."[40] This idea, incidentally, might lead Mr. Granville-Barker to support the contention presented in the *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* for Oct., 1936, that there was an intermediate version of *Hamlet* in two parts, for elsewhere he is worried about the inordinate length of some of Shaksepre's plays.[41] The main fact we wish to impress here, however, is that the critic is not always wholly consistent in revealing his great debt to his friend, Mr. Wilson, and in fact in one spot he even boasts of his inconsistence: ". . . (as the current theory about

---

33 P. 218. We should add that the critic never hesitates to use source study as good historical material also: see pp. 10, 12, 63, 266n-267n, 276, 390, 324-5.

34 Pp. 200n-201n, 90, 97n, 43. See also pp. 49, 131n, 172, 177n, 184n, 222n, 304n. He refuses to be drawn into the usurpation discussion—p. 142n.

35 See note 31.

36 P. 115n.

37 P. 160n.

38 P. 199. Compare also pp. 38n, 46n, 182, 273n, 293n, 296n.

39 P. 296n.

40 P. 198.

41 P. 21n.

Q1 requires, if it is to be consistently applied; but need it be?)"[42]

We should make a few remarks about Mr. Granville-Barker's impressionistic, personal comments on the characters of the play. These comments really form a considerable section of the main text of the book, for they appear sporadically in the long discussion of the three movements of the play (pp. 35-189) and intensively in a special section of their own entitled "The Characters" (pp. 241-329). But they are far below the rest of the book in value—a value which lies, strangely enough, mainly in the footnotes—inasmuch as they read too much like most professorial discussions of the play[43] and—even worse—are really not always wholly consistent. Hamlet, to Mr. Granville-Barker, is not an Elizabethan hero, but an "impotent coward"[44] and an irresolute bungler",[45] who weeps over Horatio and the dead body of Polonius[46] and is persistently haunted by a mother complex.[47] Yet, curiously enough, the critic turns on himself in other spots and remarks, "Most Hamlets . . . make too much of their grief",[48] "The modern playing of Hamlet is too sentimental",[49] "I fancy that Burbage shirked neither the grotesque nor the brutal";[50] and he defends Hamlet against his own soliloquies.[51] The King has "tactless tact"[52] in one spot and a "seething mind" in another, yet "Claudius does not come quite unquestionably to life."[54] the Queen is a "shallow, amiable, lymphatic creature,"[55] yet "she is drawn for us with unemphatic strokes";[56] Laertes is a "pensive

42 P. 259n. He doesn't hesitate to announce recklessly that the preparation (III, i, 49-53) for the King's break (in soliloquy—III, 3, 36-72) is a later patch in the play (p. 272). And compare his remarks on the remnant of the council scene left (pp. 106-7) and on the double-ending of the closet scene (p. 117).

43 Note especially the dullness of pp. 142-3, 286, 288, and 295.

44 P. 320.

45 P. 258. Compare pp. 40, 43, 44, 50-1, 258, 276, 292-3, 295, 301, 307-10, 316, 318-20, 326-7. The nunnery scene, we think, is very sympathetically handled.

46 P. 46n and 314.

47 Pp. 101, 296, 299, 300. On pp. 215-6 Hamlet's prose represents weakness, but on p. 308 it represents sanity!

48 P. 292.

49 P. 65n.

50 *Ibid.*

51 Pp. 44, 74-5, 77-8, 309, 311. But compare 312. He neglects the revenge soliloquies, however.

52 P. 42.

53 P. 274.

54 P. 278. For other remarks on the King see pp. 39, 92, 121, 269, 294, 320.

55 P. 285.

56 P. 284. The Queen is a foreigner (p. 142); and see pp. 289-90n.

idealist"[57] and a scoundrel on the next;[58] Polonius is quite different in different parts of the play[59]—the result of a modification by Shakspere of an original intention; and so on.[60] One wonders how Mr. Granville-Barker missed the modern discussion of the double Horatio;[61] certainly he never discovered Horatio's mild sense of humor.[62] But all such criticism in the book is both questionable and unimportant in comparison to the critic's more valuable historical and theatrical remarks. As a final comment we would of course applaud the discussion of Shakspere's verse, and especially the emphasis on the brilliancy of the dialogue in the scene in which Hamlet learns of the appearance of the Ghost: ". . . there is," Mr. Granville-Barker says, "probably no piece of verse-dialogue in all Shakespeare to touch it."[63]

If only, we cry in dying reviewing fervour, this book had had an index! Hence our careful footnotes.

---

[57] P. 258.
[58] P. 259.
[59] Pp. 61, 223, 253-4.
[60] Compare p. 252 on Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.
[61] See Messrs. G. F. Bradby and J. Dover Wilson.
[62] Mr. Kittredge always emphasized this point. Compare Mr. Granville-Barker's main remarks on pp. 244, 248, and 249. He is flatly wrong on Osric on p. 169. There are other apparent errors on pp. 55, 128, 182n, 187, 197, 243, 315.
[63] Some of his discussion of the verse is indebted to Miss Spurgeon, as he himself admits (p. 211n).

BRITISH AND AMERICAN STAGING OF SHAKSPERE

By A. MICHAEL MYERS

"HE [Shakspere] was an actor, too, accustomed to playing under difficult conditions, and he would have rejoiced to know that, as a workshop for the production of his plays, this theatre contains more perfect accommodation and equipment than any other erected in the English-speaking world. 'See these players well bestowed'—the instructions which the poet put into the mouth of Hamlet—have been faithfully carried out here today."

With these words, the Prince of Wales opened, on St. George's day, April 23rd, 1932, in Stratford, England, the Stratford Memorial Theatre.

The first of two points maintained in this discussion is that here is to be found the most modern technique in the staging of Shakspere—skilful, colorful, but always sane, an unusual vitality and physical beauty combined with a faithful adherence to both the text and the spirit of William Shakspere's plays.

The exterior has been justly criticized for its somewhat peculiar architectural quality, but it is with the stage itself that we are concerned. The best detailed description of the interior and stage is found in the Souvenir bulletin issued by the governors of the theatre at its opening:

"Not only does every seat command an uninterrupted view of the stage, but the angle of vision in every case has been devised with a view to the complete comfort of the audience rather than to any great numerical capacity. The Theatre accommodates about one thousand people, this being the average capacity of a London theatre. The performance of Shakespeare calls for intimacy as well as breadth. Ample depth below the stage has made it possible to install 'bridges' of the usual type, and, owing to the great width made available by the site, 'rolling' stages have been installed—these are a new feature in England and must not be confused with the device of a 'revolving' stage.

"Deep bays on either side of the stage have been provided in which the rolling platforms rest when not re-

quired. Here a complete scene can be set until needed. Thus it is possible to use the open stage alone or one of these platforms can be rolled into position as required. When the two rolling stages are coupled together it is possible to set three complete scenes, any one of which can be moved rapidly and without noise into position in front of the proscenium opening.

"Again, while one of the rolling stages is in use, the 'bridges' can be lowered and another set arranged on them ready to be raised as soon as the rolling stage has gone back into its bay, and when the rolling stages are 'off' the bridges can also be raised to form rostrums or other features of desired character.

"By this device it is possible to avoid the waits and noise so often occasioned by change of scene and the same rapidity and continuity of action can be ensured as when the plays were given with only curtains as their setting.

"At the same time, the construction of the fore-stage with entrances and exits outside the proscenium opening has been so designed as to facilitate the production of Shakespeare, when desirable, in a fashion approximating to that of his own day. The stage equipment includes the usual counterweight installation, a movable 'cyclorama' and a fully equipped painting gallery and frame. Scene docks adequate to the needs of Repertoire (eight different plays are given in a week) are provided with capacious property room and carpenter's shop."

Important as this perfection of equipment is, it is only the physical side of the production of a Shaksperian play. And the Stratford Players are fully aware of this. Never, not even in the director's favorite scene, the storm and the sinking of the ship at the beginning of *The Tempest,* are these splendid external features allowed to interfere with interpretation of character—major and minor—or with a true rendition of the beauty of Shakspere's poetry.

Never can it be said of The Stratford Players what a critic said of Elliston's nineteenth-century staging of *Lear* by that great genius Edmund Kean: "He staged so fine a

storm that it blew the King out of notice."* Nor as George Jean Nathan said, and said truly, of Bel Geddes' production of *Hamlet:* "Bel Geddes did everything to the play except bring Moran and Mack on in the players' scene and have Hamlet die in a snowstorm."

Nor as Richard Watts, Jr., said, with equal truth, of the in-general-very-fine production, Leslie Howard's *Hamlet:* "Stewart Cheney, the scene designer, is the chief hero of the evening." Nor does one ever, in a Stratford production, lose William Shakspere in a calculation of height, weight, circumference and general arrangement of pillars, staircases and screens to produce what Mr. Gordon Craig chooses to call "the spiritual symbol of a room." No one can say of any Stratford production what Richard Lockridge said of the Lunts' burlesque version of *The Taming of the Shrew:* "They have so earnestly shaken the professors out of Shakespeare that they have very nearly shaken the play out too. Dwarfs and bright costumes, songs and dances and the like are all very well, but in this case they obscure the story a little. The play has been cut deeply to minimize the intricacies of the plot, and there has been an evident effort to touch only the high spots. . . . Add to this the inescapable fact that neither of the Lunts speak their lines too clearly and you have something which is neither quite circus nor altogether play."

The British version of this play which this writer had seen at Stratford only a few weeks before the Lunts' version, though adequately staged in every respect, including an even fuller use of The Induction, never lost sight of the very important fact that this was a *Shaksperian* play, and plainly proved that Shakspere's characterization and poetry, though not equal to his later masterpieces, had greatly improved since *Love's Labour's Lost.* In addition, the Stratford production presented a *blend* not a *clash* of scenery, a clash which with the Lunts became at times almost as harsh as their diction.

Many additional illustrations might be given, did space permit, of the American undue stress on scenic and other

* Quoted by Harold Child, "Shakespeare in the theatre from the Restoration to the present time" in *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies,* ed. H. Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, Macmillan, 1934.

stage effects. The contrast in this important respect in Stratford productions is perfectly summarized in Chesterton's comment on *Twelfth Night* at its first performance after the opening of the new theatre: "The miracle of the stage equipment, the indescribable beauty of the lighting, the sheer art of the costuming, the majestic cycloramic distances, the inspiration of the direction, the exquisite slickness and synchronization of the production" were all very impressive, but "amidst the marvelous contrivances of the evening we did not become oblivious of the debt to Shakespeare."

This last clause—"we did not become oblivious of the debt to Shakespeare"—serves both as the most serious indictment of the majority of non-Stratford productions of Shakspere and as an introduction to the second and more important part of our discussion. One should, however, add Chesterton's final sentence of his criticism as a part of this introduction: "Taken all in all, a very lovely performance indeed on the part of the whole company." In these seven words, *on the part of the whole company,* lies the keynote to the real prosperity of The Stratford Company.

In other productions we have Barrymore's, Hampden's, Howard's and Gielgud's Hamlet, Warfield's and Arliss's Shylock, and Jane Cowl's, Eva le Galliene's and Katherine Cornell's Juliet. We exploit the leading rôles at the expense both of all the other rôles and of the play. And *all* the rôles are important in a Shaksperian play. Very few American producers recognize the need of any knowledge of Shakspere on the part of any but the leading characters. Who else in America has said with Miss Cornell, "In a Shakespeare play even small rôles can't be given to second-rate people"? One must add, however, that with the exception of Maurice Evans as Romeo and Ralph Richardson as Mercutio, she failed to carry out her conviction in her staging of *Romeo and Juliet.* With the possible exception of Fritz Leiber—who unfortunately had a very mediocre supporting company—has any other American producer acknowledged the dramatic importance of the *minor* Shaksperian characters? Mr. Leiber also realized the value of good diction, for he said, "I believe that the lines should not be mouthed nor given with sonorous effect, but spoken as human talk to one another."

Almost without exception, in American productions, the stars completely overshadow the rest of the cast. In the Lunts' *Taming of the Shrew,* for example, there were only four other members of the cast, Richard Whorf as Sly, Bretaigne Windust as Tranio, Sydney Greenstreet as Baptista, and George Graham as Gremio, who had any conception of the meaning of Shaksperian characterization or of Shaksperian diction. Even in the most scholarly and artistic production of the play and the finest interpretation of the leading rôle this generation has seen, the cast of John Gielgud's *Hamlet* contained only three actors with any experience in Shaksperian rôles. Both John Emery (Laertes) and Malcolm Keen (Claudius) have had extensive experience in Shaksperian repertorie, and Arthur Byron played Jaques to Maude Adams' Rosalind. All the other members of the cast were playing in a Shaksperian play for the first time! And in Bel Geddes' *Hamlet,* Colin Keith-Johnstone as Laertes and Leon Quartermaine as Horatio were the only two in the cast, besides Raymond Massey as Hamlet, who were anything more than fairly adequate Broadway actors. Never has this play-goer heard so fine a Broadway version of Shakspere's English! Mr. Quartermaine was also Miss Jane Cowls sole support in the rôle of Malvolio in her staging of *Twelfth Night.* Did Robert Mantell have anyone except his charming and capable wife, Genevieve Hamper, to support him, or George Arliss anyone except Peggy Wood, or Walter Hampden anyone?

In the Stratford Company one finds balance and proportion. Here each member of the cast is not only an experienced actor, but an experienced *Shaksperian* actor—a difference of the very greatest importance. Each player, *major* and *minor,* adds his part to the unity, dramatic sweep and power of the play. None is off key. Each makes his contribution to the general effect of harmony, and the inevitable result is a well balanced, even, artistic, unified performance, a "solid, ensemble excellence."

This can come only through the opportunity for each player to play a variety of rôles. Herein lies another reason for this company's superiority. Kenneth Wicksteed, for instance, plays Lavache, the clown in *All's Well That Ends Well,* Bardolph in *Henry the Fourth,* Tubal in *Merchant of Venice,* Trinculo in *The Tempest,* Alexas, an attendant

in *Antony and Cleopatra,* Sir Oliver Martext in *As You Like It,* alternating in the part of Adam, Sir Andrew Aguecheek in *Twelfth Night,* Perdita's father, the old Shepherd in *Winter's Tale,* Starveling the tailor in *Midsummer Night's Dream,* Sir Hugh Evans, the Welsh parson in *Merry Wives of Windsor,* Duke of Cornwall in *Lear,* and John of Gaunt in *Richard the Second.* Concerning Randle Ayrton, the stage director and without dobut the best actor the company had, Chesterton says, "I have never seen Mr. Ayrton give a performance that was less than magnificent." This versatile man plays Enobarbus in *Antony and Cleopatra,* Malvolio in *Twelfth Night,* Touchstone in *As You Like It,* Leontes in *The Winter's Tale,* Vincentio in *Measure for Measure,* Ford in *Merry Wives of Windsor,* Shylock in *Merchant of Venice,* Quince the carpenter in *Midsummer Night's Dream,* and the title rôles in *Henry the Fourth,* and *Lear.* Mr. Ayrton's portrayal of Lear one evening and an equally effective interpretation of the part of Quince the carpenter the next afternoon is the present writer's choice of the finest example of versatility he has ever seen in any theatre. The versatility of Roy Byford, ranging from his incomparable Falstaff to the first gravedigger in *Hamlet* and Mardian the eunuch in *Antony and Cleopatra;* or the range of Eric Maxon, of Neil Porter, or of almost any member of the entire company, could also be cited.

It is true that a few—Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Byford and Mr. Wicksteed in particular—take the majority of the leading rôles, but even they also play minor rôles in some of the plays. And the minor rôles in all of the plays are in the hands of actors most of whom are capable of doing even the major rôles. The result is a complete characterization of all the rôles, the distinctness of individual characterization that Shakspere intended for all the characters in his plays. This last fact is not always understood or appreciated by the English theatre-going public. Some of these people have become infected with the American mania for stars and for bizarre stage effects, and in London especially one sometimes hears complaints regarding the stress by the Stratford Players on ensemble acting. But these objectors are in the minority. Most of those who have seen other productions of Shakspere and all who have seen American productions

agree that here is the stage equipment and here is the ensemble acting Shakspere himself would choose.

A part of this versatility that has been mentioned in passing but that should be stressed more emphatically in conclusion is the manner in which each of The Stratford players learn to "speak the speech trippingly." It is in this particular that the importance of ability in the minor rôles is best seen. Most American actors, even many of the best, have but little sense of the dignity and beauty of Shakspere's English. No less an actress than Miss Cornell admits her difficulty with the Shaksperian line. Of course, few American actors admit or even realize this difficulty. But there *is* a *proper* Shaksperian diction. It consists of more than an ability to read Shakspere's poetic lines. It is the much greater ability to make those lines sound at one and the same time both musical and like the current idiom of English usage. Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Randle Ayrton of The Stratford Company excels. He speaks a line of Shakspere almost like a line of Modern English prose, international rather than British, and yet retains all the music of Shakspere's Elizabethan English. In most productions of Shakspere there is, as A. V. Cookman said of a recent London production, "no single echo of a beautiful thing beautifully said," whereas, in every Stratford production, the audience has, as the same critic said of a recent performance of *Samson Agonistes* at Oxford, "the pleasure of hearing verse of intense and overpowering beauty finely spoken."

It is in these respects, then—proper subordination of scenery and an interpretation of major and minor rôles in good Shaksperian diction—that the superiority of the Stratford Players exists. One may well say that with them "The production of Shakespeare is a moral responsibility", and even add another sentence from the address of the Lord Bishop of Coventry in the Stratford Parish Church on the Sunday after the opening of The Memorial Theatre: "They are unusually sincere in their desire so to play Shakespeare as simply to interpret him rather than to glorify themselves or to make their audiences purr."

Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pa.

SOME NOTES ON ROBERT FROST AND SHAKSPERE

By Robert S. Newdick

THOUGH there may be an exception here and there down the stream of the years, certainly the poets who have written in English since 1616 have deferred to Shakspere. In extreme youth they may have deferred to the master because they were taught to do so; in young manhood their deference may have sprung from their eager enthusiasm in personal rediscovery; but surely in full maturity they deferred to him in the rich wisdom born of their countless observations, rivalries, comparisons, judgments, and responses. Among the relatively few spears of literary forces to which Robert Frost, like the Swiss patriot, has opened his arms embracingly, Shakspere's has pierced him most deeply.

Frost has not yet spoken of his schoolboy response to Shakspere, but in view of known facts, the reasonable conjectures are that his enjoyment was not marred by out of season concentration on minute points of vocabulary and usage and that he was fortunate in those early years in being led, perhaps by his literary mother, to delight in the plays as plays.

Between his first brief taste of college at Dartmouth in 1892, when he was seventeen, and his return to college at Harvard in 1897, after his marriage, Frost worked at a variety of occupations. One of his jobs was that of light-trimmer in a Lawrence mill. On dark cloudy days his time was taken up completely and he worked steadily, but on bright sunshiny days there was little for him to do and he had an abundance of free time. Sometimes, utilizing the strength and skill that high-school footbal had developed in him, he boxed or wrestled with fellow millworkers in these intervals. Often, however, he went off by himself to read.

His favorite reading was in his pocket Shakspere. And as he read he marked the text, as young men will, underlining favorite passages, and making particular record of his judgment as to just how this or that speech or passage or line should be read in order to interpret it aright. This

close study of Shakspere of course left its evidences in his early verse, evidences more numerous and significant than his utilization of a phrase from *Macbeth* ("Out, out —") as the title of a poem. Frost has said that a young poet must inevitably "begin as a cloud of all the other poets he ever read." The reader who knows his Shakspere as intimately as Frost early came to know him will encounter not a few wisps of that poet in the "cloud" of other poets that are to be glimpsed in Frost's early poems.

There is more to be said, too, concerning Frost's youthful marking of Shakspere's text. Many, many years after his millhand days he came upon that old pocket Shakspere of his. By that time, however, he realized that his annotations were unnecessary: "Shakespeare himself, by his way of writing, had given or indicated his own directions. There was only one way to read each word." The mature Frost, in other words, found in Shakspere's practice one of the cardinal points in his own practice as an artist, namely, the faithful observance of natural speech rhythms.

Of course he found in Shakspere much more than accurate "voice-posturing," as he has called it. In 1915, shortly after his triumphant return from England, where *A Boy's Will* (1913) had been praised and *North of Boston* (1914) had been acclaimed, Frost settled on a farm near Franconia in New Hampshire. That summer and the next he became friends with Professor Morris P. Tilley of the University of Michigan who was spending his vacation in the White Mountains. In one of their conversations Professor Tilley, after urging Frost to try his hand at drama, had occasion to quote Pope's dictum, to the effect that in one of the weakest of Shakspere's plays, *Love's Labour's Lost,* the speeches are so characteristic that if the names of the speakers had not been left to us we should still be able to assign each line to the proper character. That interested Frost and he spoke to the point out of his own experience: "I have three characters speaking in one poem, and I was not satisfied until I got them to speak so true to their characters that no mistake could be made as to who was speaking. I would never put the names of the speakers in front of what they were saying." (The poem alluded to is probably "Snow.")

At a later time, submitting to a professional interviewer who was enquiring particularly about poetic drama, Frost differentiated two kinds of passages in Shakspere: "There are the speaking passages and the rhetorical passages to choose from. When I think of successful poetic drama I think of the speaking passages. They are the best of Shakspere to me. Lean, sharp sentences, with the give and take, the thread of thought and action quick, not lost in a maze of metaphor or adjective."

It was these speaking passages that, when he had occasion to teach Shakspere at Amherst in the spring of 1917, Frost led his students to emphasize. In that course he was substituting for Professor Churchill, the thorough scholar who regularly taught Shakspere, and there were those who were prompt to be scandalized and to ask, "How can a poet be competent to speak with authority on dates and sources?' But Frost was not concerned with dates and sources. "Those who were curious found his classes in Shakspere in College Hall extemporaneously acting one-hour versions of the plays which the students had arranged." So wrote an Amherst man, who added, significantly, "For us the breeze was blowing."

Told not long ago of the obscurantist president of a middle-western university who was once foolish enough to declare "If I had my way, all the libraries in the world would be burned to the ground every ten years," Frost exclaimed, "Not a bad idea: with Shakspere out of the way, we poets would have a chance again!" Which, like so many of Frost's sayings, even offhand ones, is both a witticism and a great deal more.

In full earnestness—for those who prefer that truth be spoken sententiously—Frost has iterated and reiterated that "the height of poetry is in dramatic give and take. Drama is the capstone of poetry." In short, at the very heart of Frost's credo and practice as an artist lies his conviction of the complete supremacy of the dramatic and the Shaksperian.

Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. Tannenbaum

A PASSAGE IN *PERICLES*

At the suggestion of my friend Professor Hastings I turned my attention to a passage in IV, i, of *Pericles* which Dr. Rolfe characterizes as a "hopeless crux" and which is well-calculated to illustrate the arbitrary ways of editors and emendators of Shakspere's text. The passage in question (IV, i, 4-6) is part of Dionyza's final instructions to her creature Leonine, whom she has hired to murder the lovely Marina; it is printed in the first quarto as prose thus:

> 'let not conscience which is but cold, in flaming, thy loue bosome, enflame too nicelie'.

The general purport of the passage is clear enough. Dionyza is afraid that Marina's charm and beauty will arouse sexual passion (which she calls "love" —a perfectly correct use of the word) in Leonine and that this may awaken conscientious considerations because of which he will not have the heart to kill her. But this meaning is certainly not to be found in the words as printed in Q1. In Q2 (also published in 1609) the passage is printed thus:

> 'let not conscience which is but cold, in flaming thy loue bosome, enflame too nicely,'

differing from Q1 only in the punctuation but not making any better sense. Folios 3 and 4, we are told, agree with Q2; the play, we may remind the reader, does not appear in the first two Folios.

Many attempts to emend the passage are recorded. Malone, we are told by Mr. K. Deighton in his edition of the play, boldly departing from his author, read "inflame love in thy bosom" and omitted the words "inflame too nicely"—which is editing with a vengeance; Steevens read "inflame thy loving bosom" without stopping to think how these words (if they were what the author wrote) could have been corrupted into "inflaming, thy loue bosome". The much despised Zachary Jackson, a printer, suggested reading "conscience, which is best [!] cold, inflaming thy live bosom,"—which has the sole merit of being very near to the *ductus literarum* of the original. An anonymous critic (recorded by Charlotte Porter) suggested reading "in flaming love, thy bosom inflame". The scholarly Singer read "inflaming love, thy bosome inflame". The ingenious Collier sugested that the author's original text read "infusing love in thy bosom"; subsequently he suggested changing "enflame" to "inform"—a reading which Rev. Henry N. Hudson adopted. Mr. Hudson is said to have suggested changing "inflaming love" to "enforcing law". Samuel Bailey propoosed a very sensible reading—"Let not conscience, which is but cold, enfeeble; nor love thy bosom Inflame too nicely"—which cannot be justified. After all, an editor should not presume to re-write his author's work. The boldest of the emendations suggested is Mr. Benjamin Gott Kinnear's

> 'let not conscience,
> Which is a coward, but inflaming love
> I' th' bosom, thine inflame too nicely'.

Charles Knight, who is followed by almost all modern editors, read,

> 'Let not conscience,
> Which is but cold, inflaming love i' thy bosom,
> Inflame too nicely;'

This, it will be admitted, makes good sense but the versification—in spite of the deceptive apostrophe after the letter *i*—is not Shaksperian. Shakspere

nowhere has such a fifth foot as "i' thy bosom." Mr. Knight's emendation is, of course, objectionable on other grounds, too.

Mr. Deighton, not seeing how a cold conscience can inflame, reads

> 'Let not conscience,
> Which is but cold, or flaming love thy bosom
> Enslave too nicely;'

Undoubtedly Mr. Deighton's reading makes sense but he attains his reading by too many violent departures from his original and his objections to Knight's reading are far-fetched. Besides, the first half of his sentence lacks a predicate.

It should be added that Miss Porter, as usual, attempts a defence of the original text. She thinks that the sentence is inverted—"let not conscience . . . thy love bosome, enflame too nicelie"—and that "conscience" is the object, and "love bosome" the subject —a construction which is not only un-Shaksperian but impossible. And what is a "love-bosom"?

Assuming that the passage was intended for verse and having a due regard to the original text, and bearing in mind the great similarity to each other of many letters in the secretary script, we read

> 'Let not conscience,
> Which is but cold, inflaming thy love, become
> Enflam'd too nicely;'

This makes good sense and departs from the original in ways with which we are perfectly familiar. The compositor of the quarto mistook "become" for "bosome" because the scribe's *e* and *o*, *c* and small *s*, as often happens, were indistinguishable. "In flaming" for "inflaming" is only an instance of a word, written discontinuously, being mistaken for two words, as in Hamlet's "a doubt" for "adoulter," "a Doo" for "ado," and many others. "Enflame" for "Enflamd" is very easy. Dionyza implies that conscience is akin to pity and that pity may turn to love. This throws light also on what she proceeds to say about pity.

EXIT SHAKSPERE

To our great amazement we learn that there is a movement afoot in certain circles to drive Shakspere and the English classics out of our High Schools. The purpose of this is said to be to make room for American and contemporary poetry and prose courses. Needless to say we consider this a preposterous notion. Nothing in contemporary poetry, American or foreign, can begin to compare with Shakspere for educational and cultural value. In the fields of linguistics, dramaturgy, literary art, practical psychology, history, and humanism Shakspere has more to offer to young America than all our living and dead writers combined. But this is only our personal opinion. We would like to hear from our members and teachers of English what they think of this matter.

One of the most valuable essays on Shaksperian topics published this year is Professor H. T. Price's paper, "Towards a scientific method of textual criticism for the Elizabethan drama." The reader will find it in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* for April, on pages 151 to 167. In it the bibliographical school of critics, as represented by Pollard, Greg, and Wilson, are given a thorough and well-deserved spanking. Their work is proved to be arbitrary and unscientific in method, valueless as to results, and dangerous as examples for young scholars. The essay should be read and pondered by everyone who takes scholarship in this age of slovenly thinking seriously.

Lovers of Hamlet—and who does not love Hamlet?—will profit from the reading of an essay by Mr. Thomas Pyles in the June, 1937, issue of *ELH*. He makes a very careful examination of the second quarto text and concludes that Mr. J. D. Wilson has not been "very faithful to his chosen text," that his edition "is much more eclectic, much less revolutionary" than he would have us believe, and that "the second quarto is a much better text than even Mr. Wilson thinks it is." We by no means accept all of Mr. Pyles's interpretations and we wish he had applied the paleographic method to the study of some of the quarto's textual peculiarities. Had he done so he would have found that the Folio text is vastly superior to the quarto's.

One of the most industrious Shaksperians in America—Mr. Anderson M. Baten (of Texas)—and a member of our association, has just published a thick and heavy ocatavo volume entitled *The Philosophy of Shakespeare* (618 pages, with four illustrations, for $5, published at Kingsport, Tennessee, by the Kingsport Press) which should interest our younger members especially. Liberal quotations from the plays and poems illustrate Shakspere's "philosophy." The bulk of the book, however, consists of a reprint of Col. Ingersoll's famous and brilliant essay on our poet, as well as of a reprint of Victor Hugo's dubiously valuable book on Shakspere. It is a pity that Mr. Baten had not the time (he is at work on a huge Shakspere dictionary) to correct his proofs better and to edit Hugo's book. Had he done the latter he would surely have corrected the utterly incorrect statement (page 253) that the Shakspere "family had for coat-of-arms an arm holding a lance,—allusive arms, which were confirmed, they say, by Queen Elizabeth in 1595, and apparent, at the time we write, on Shakespeare's tomb in the church of Stratford-on-Avon,"—a statement which is as far from the truth (in various details) as Mr. Wilson's *What Happens in Hamlet*. Incidentally it may be noted that Mr. Baten's beautiful representation of the Shakspere arms is also incorrect as regards a number of details.

The textual history of *Richard III* has been the subject of much study. The latest book on the subject—a work which seems to us to end the disputes and to solve the problems sensibly and logically—is Mr. David L. Patrick's monograph *The Textual History of "Richard III"* (Stanford University Press, 1936, pages 154, $2. in cloth). The author concludes that "The quarto version is a text made by ear from rehearsal or performance of the play. It contains therefore the changes made in the play by the Chamberlain's Men as they presented it prior to 1597. These changes include a great many deliberate alterations made by the prompter or stage manager. The Folio version, once thought inferior, presents the lines of the play in approximately their original form." In this book it is shown that the bibliographic method of studying textual problems does not give results of any value. We congratulate Professoor Hardin Craig on having in some measure been responsible for this excellent piece of work.

Speaking of Professor Craig reminds us that we owe him a heavy debt, to wit: to urge our readers—all, young and old, scholars and amateurs—to provide themselves with the best, the sanest, the most reliable, most scholarly, and most comprehensive book on Shakspere written this century. We mean Professor Craig's *Shakespeare: A Historical and Critical Study* (pub-

lished by Scott, Foresman & Co. of Chicago, and consisting of 1,200 pages). The volume includes the carefully edited and annotated texts of twenty-one of Shakspere's plays. We know of no manual and reference work to compare with it. We would suggest that the book be re-published without the plays, so as to make it easier to handle and to read.

Those who do not take their Shakspere too seriously—and there are many such—will find diversion (if nothing else) in a book recently published by the Oxford University Press (118 pages, with three illustrations and some diagrams, for $2.). It is entitled *The Thane of Cawdor: A Detective Story,* and is written by Mr. D. Baird. The author tells the story from the viewpoint of the super-analytical doctor who was called in by Macbeth to minister to his queen. It's all good fun but we must confess that we stopped reading where the learned doctor suggests that Lady Macbeth had hired the "Witches" to waylay her victorious husband on the blasted heath and prophesy kingship, etc., to him.

Librarians and serious students of English literature will do well to acquaint themselves with a periodical publication which has just come to our notice. It is the *West Virginia University Bulletin,* published at Morgantown, W. Va. The current issue, dated "May, 1937," includes several noteworthy essays; among these we note especially Professor John W. Draper's paper, "The prince philosopher and Shakespeare's Hamlet," Miss Eleanor J. Haller's essay, "The realism of the Merry Wives,' and Professor S. F. Crocker's essay on Rochester's *Satire against Mankind.* The magazine is beautifully printed and well-edited.

THE JAY OF ITALY

Cymbeline, it is generally acknowledged, is still marred with many textual difficulties. Among these one of the most tantalizing is the passage in which Imogen expresses her fear that her absent husband has fallen victim to the blandishments and charms of some Italian beauty. She expresses this in the following words:

> Some Iay of Italy
> (Whose mother was her painting) hath betraid him.

The words enclosed within the parenthesis have puzzled the commentators. Why should Imogen's mind at this moment turn to her rival's mother? And what can she possibly mean by saying that her mother was her painting? Those who try to wring sense out of the passage without emending it say, after Dr. Johnson, that she owed her beauty to her skill as a painter, and that in this sense her painting was her mother. The Cambridge editors, from whom we would have expected something more sensible, said, "If the text be right, the meaning probably is 'whose mother aided and abetted her daughter in her trade of seduction'." Needless to say, both these are very forced interpretations and from a psychological viewpoint utterly improbable. Because of the reference to the jay—a beautifully colored bird—the critics all—with the notable exception of Theobald, of all people—feel that there is nothing wrong with the word "painting" and that the corruption—if corruption there be—must be in the word "mother". From the Furness Variorum we learn that Capell substituted "feather" for "mother"; Bailey suggested "plumage" as a substitute, Dr. Cartwright "favour", J. G. Herr "colour", Sprenger "broker", Becket "motheur", and Gould, bolder than the rest and more ruthless, proposed reading "Whose

honour was her plaything". The prosaic John Bulloch, fortified only with the comment of the Cambridge editors, even went so far as to suggest replacing "betraid" with "bed-laid"—to harmonize with his reading "Whose mother was her pander". (The Furness Variorum incorrectly says that Bulloch's proposal was to substitute "pander" for "mother".) For the amusement of our readers—if such nonsense can be amusing—we record Lewis Theobald's suggestion that "the Poet might have wrote 'whose mother was her planting.' *i.e.,* was bawd to her, and planted her on Posthumus: which is still more sarcasticall." Bishop Warburton, anticipating the methods of Steevens, thought Shakspere might have written "meether" (a north country word signifying *beauty*") instead of "mother"—although no lexicographer seems to have the slightest knowledge of such a word. It is almost incredible—although almost anything is credible in a Shaksperian scholar—that Charles Knight ventured to suggest "whose muffler was her painting" because "jays" were accustomed to wearing a veil or mask called a "muffler".

Mr. Zachary Jackson—whose name is a byword for emendatory incompetence and presumptuousness — surprised at the want of judgment shown by his predecessors, confidently proposed to read "Some jay of Italy, Who smoother was; her painting hath betrayed him". Almost as bad, perhaps even worse, is Mr. Dowden's suggestion that Shakspere might have intended Imogen to say, "Some jay of Italy, Whose mother was [a whore]—her painting hath betray'd him."

The most famous of the emendations of this passage is the notorious John P. Collier's endorsement of his manuscript emendator's reading "who smothers her [*i.e.,* herself] with painting". This is undoubtedly ingenious but, as has been pointed out, also prosaic. A more serious objection to this reading, vigorously defended by Collier, is the fact that it is not an emendation, but a rewriting of Shakspere and such an error as would not have resulted from a mishearing of the text or from a misreading.

After this necessarily brief survey of one of the most depressing illustrations of the fatuousness of much Shaksperian commentary, we wish to offer an emendation which, we think, is in accordance with the rules of the game of textual emendation, accords with Shakspere's style, is psychologically appropriate, can be paralleled by similar expressions in our poet, and is apparently the result of a misreading of the poet's manuscript.

> Some jay of Italy
> (Whose maker was her painting) hath
> betray'd him.

Minuscular *a* is very easily mistaken for an *o* (hence such misreadings as "one" for "and," "flows" for "flaws," "o" for "a" (= he). In the extant specimens of Thomas Heywood's atrocious handwriting it is almost impossible to distinguish *a*'s from *o*'s. Persons familiar with the aberrations of Elizabethan penmen in the formation of letters having an infra-linear tail—and the letter *k* was often written with such a flourish—will have no difficulty in seeing how a *k* might be mistaken for *th.* (One or two such *k*'s are shown in Kellner's *Restoring Shakespeare,* on page 201.) The vertical unlooped stem of the *k* is often identical with a *t,* and the descending loop of the *k* can easily be made so as to look like an *h.* If any be inclined to doubt this, let them consult Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps's *A Dixtionary of Misprints,* where they will find (page 15) a record of the word "breathe" having been misprinted for "break"—a *th-k* error; "he when" for "hearken" (page 40), "party" for "park" (page 57), "speech" for "speak" page 73), "thing" for "king" (page 78), "work" for "worth" (page 88), exactly the kind of mistake (misreading) we are predicating for this passage in *Cymbeline.*

Literary evidences in support of this emendation may be found in the pages of the Variorum in which this passage is discussed.